234.7E
B872eE

THE GENERAL THEOLOGICAL
SEMINARY LIBRARY
CHELSEA SQUARE, NEW YORK II, N. Y.

D & T BDY. OCT 18 '56

EXAMEN CENSURÆ:

OR

AN ANSWER TO CERTAIN STRICTURES,

&c.

EXAMEN CENSURÆ:

OR

AN ANSWER TO CERTAIN STRICTURES

BEFORE UNPUBLISHED,

ON A BOOK ENTITLED

HARMONIA APOSTOLICA,

&c.

BY GEORGE BULL,

PRIEST OF THE ENGLISH CHURCH.

TO WHICH IS ADDED,

AN APOLOGY

FOR

THE HARMONY AND ITS AUTHOR,

IN ANSWER TO THE DECLAMATION OF T. TULLY, D.D.

IN A BOOK LATELY PUBLISHED BY HIM,

AND ENTITLED

JUSTIFICATIO PAULINA.

BY THE SAME.

OXFORD,

JOHN HENRY PARKER.

MDCCCXLIII.

234.7E
B892eE

12346

OXFORD:
PRINTED BY I. SHRIMPTON.

ADVERTISEMENT.

The present translations have been made from Dr. Burton's edition of Bishop Bull's works, and, together with the Indices of matter and texts, are entirely new. References to such works as have been re-edited since Bishop Bull's death, are enclosed in brackets. For a fuller account of the publication of the Examen and Apology, than appears in the Preface, the reader is referred to the Life of the Author by Nelson, whose elaborate analysis of the controversy is too long for insertion. See especially chapters 17, and 41—49.

The translations being from different hands, will account for some slight variations in style, and other unimportant points of difference.

Oxford, January, 1843.

TO THE READER.

It is now nearly seven years, most gentle reader, since I published two Dissertations on the reconcilement of the Apostles St. Paul and St. James on the point of justification, under the title of "Harmonia Apostolica." About a year, if I remember, after the book was published, a copy of it was sent to me with remarks written on the margin of the book by a divine[a], with whom at the time I was totally unacquainted; some sheets also were attached at the end, which contained Strictures from the same hand. This divine did not send his remarks direct to me; he had them first sent round to certain very reverend Prelates of our Church, to whom he sent letters at the same time, complaining with a most tragical vehemence (as if Hannibal were at the gates) that I had asserted some new and most pernicious doctrines, thoroughly opposed to the decrees of the English and all the reformed Churches; and he urged the reverend fathers to oppose themselves at once with all their authority to so grave and so enormous an offence. One of them (the very reverend Father and Lord William Nicholson, late Bishop of Gloucester, to whom I had dedicated my Dissertations) at last sent me the book covered with marginal notes, together with the papers added at the end.

I read through the Strictures, and, a few months after, wrote (at spare hours, and as other business would allow) an answer to them, (which I now publish,) for the inspection of the reverend Prelate before mentioned, and others to whom he might think fit to shew it. I wrote them, as usual at first, in haste, and in characters that I could afterwards scarcely read myself without the aid of memory, and I could not immediately bring myself to undertake the task of copying them more legibly, (no sort of work is so wearisome to me,) espe-

[a] [Charles Gataker. Vid. Life, p. 91.]

cially as the reverend Bishop by no means urged it, often saying that he did not think much of the Strictures, and I was at the time engaged in other studies. Not long after, that holy Prelate, my beloved patron and protector, departed this life for the home of the blessed, after whose death I gave up all thoughts of copying out my papers, still less did I think of publishing them.

However, a year ago and more, a book came out by the reverend Thomas Tully, D.D., with the title "Justificatio Paulina," directed expressly against me; and on some of my friends, pious and learned men, repeatedly urging me to publish some answer to it, I began at length to think afresh of copying out and finishing the neglected papers. I found, in fact, that if you take away from the Doctor's book the declamatory part, together with a short Dissertation annexed on St. Paul's meaning in his seventh chapter to the Romans, there would be scarce any thing left that had not been already answered in the Examination of the Strictures: so I thought it better to put forth the Examen first, then to subjoin an Apology in answer to the declamation of the reverend gentleman, comprising an answer at the same time to the annexed Dissertation. That the Apology did not appear for so long, nor until after the death of Dr. Tully, against whom it is put forth, was owing partly to my long doubting whether I should give an answer at all, partly to the tediousness of copying out the Examen, which I thought it best to prefix, and partly and principally to the waste of time by the printers in bringing out the Examen. In truth, I had little pleasure in combating with the dead, still less in triumphing over their ashes; a species of barbarity one most shrinks from. Accordingly, as soon as I heard of the death of the reverend gentleman, unwilling to be severe on the departed, I erased many personal remarks against him, (though they were true, and to some of my friends seemed absolutely necessary, yet) I had them erased from the sheets of the Apology which were not yet printed: more I would gladly have erased, could it have been done without injury (not to myself, but) to truth. That sentence of Basil, Epist. 63. to the Neocæsarienses, was before me: "We must answer calumnies, not that we may avenge ourselves by the contra-

[Vol. iii. ed. Ben. Ep. 207.]

diction, but that we may hinder a road being paved for falsehood, and extricate those who have been deceived from harmful error."

I must not omit to say that the Appendix to the Examination of Stricture XVII, was written lately, or rather copied from other papers of mine, and inserted there to answer the objections of Mr. Truman, who published a book against me, in English, entitled, "An Attempt to correct some Opinions that are gaining ground contrary to the Doctrine of the Church of England." Whoever will take the trouble to read attentively the Appendix, together with my answers to Strictures XVIII—XXIII, and compare them with Mr. Truman's book, will, unless I am much mistaken, see clearly that the grounds of his book are thoroughly disproved. If, however, I am given to understand that pious and learned men demand a fuller refutation of his objections, I have one ready, and will presently lay it before them.

As to the bulk to which my defence hath grown, I regret it, but knew not how to avoid the inconvenience, for from the number of objections which my opponents strongly urged against the truth which I am defending, I must either have observed a total silence, or said not a little in return: however, of the points which I answer, if there are any which the more learned of my readers think comparatively of little moment, and consequently scarcely worth refuting, they may pass them by altogether, while I would wish them to remember that no small portion of my readers will perchance be those to whom the smallest points may create great difficulty, and their difficulties I would regard at the expense of my estimation with readers of more fastidious nicety.

While this volume was in the press the Animadversions of Mr. John Tombes of Bewdley, against the Harmony, appeared: a work, in which the self-confidence of the author seems so much to vie with his ignorance, that it is difficult to say which is the greater. He, however, need not fear "the horns and stamping of the Bull[b]," (such is his wit, which foreigners will scarcely understand, Englishmen will smile at,) since the Bull has long since learnt to despise all such barking animals. But to be serious on a serious subject, I cannot but pity a

[b] P. 81. and p. 226.

man, who, while he is so unfortunately curious in other people's business, has neglected, so many years, though often refuted by learned men, to review and retract what he has written so wantonly against the practice of infant baptism, every where received in the Catholic Church. I do from my heart pray that he may at length look to his own case, and seriously reflect how greatly he has promoted by his writings the wicked schism and heresy of the Anabaptist party in England, and repent timely and worthily of so grievous a sin.

I have only now to ask thee, benevolent reader, in reading and deciding on these writings, to lay aside prejudice and party feeling, and to exercise the candour that befits a Christian. Farewell.

INDEX OF

TITLES AND MATTER IN THE EXAMEN.

PREFACE OF THE CENSURER, WITH THE EXAMINATION OF IT.

(Page 1.)

ANSWER TO STRICTURE I.

(Page 5.)

It is proved against the Censurer by many arguments, that it is far more reasonable to interpret St. Paul from St. James, than St. James from St. Paul.

ANSWER TO STRICTURE II.

(Page 15.)

The expression 'perfected faith,' is defended against the Censurer.—The question, Whether love is rightly said to be the form of justifying faith, is discussed at length.

ANSWER TO STRICTURE III.

(Page 23.)

The question, Whether the notion of Gospel justification necessarily includes the imputation of reward, or the acceptance of a man to eternal life and salvation, is sifted; or, in other words, Whether the conferring a right to the kingdom of heaven is properly an act of Gospel justification.

ANSWER TO STRICTURE IV.

(Page 31.)

It is shewn that in attributing to faith the operation causing righteousness, the Censurer teaches a new and dangerous doctrine.

ANSWER TO STRICTURE V.

(Page 32.)

Our paraphrase of the passage Acts 10. 34, 35, is defended against the Censurer.

ANSWER TO STRICTURE VI.

(Page 36.)

Our interpretation of the passage 1 Pet. 1. 2, is supported by the authority of Erasmus, Estius, and even Calvin.

ANSWER TO STRICTURE VII.

(Page 37.)

The question between the author of the Harmony and the Censurer is reduced to these four heads: 1st, Whether there be any assignable condition, properly so called, of the Gospel covenant, which is not also a condition of Gospel justification. 2ndly, Whether, it being granted that the condition of the Gospel covenant, and of Gospel justification may be different, it is not yet certain that faith and repentance are conditions of one and the same benefit, viz. of Gospel justification. 3rdly, Whether forgiveness of sins comes into the very notion or definition of Gospel justification, or whether the notion of Gospel justification necessarily includes forgiveness of sins. 4thly, Whether, it being granted that forgiveness of sins is not necessarily included in the notion of Gospel justification, it is not yet certain that the condition of both benefits, viz. Gospel forgiveness and Gospel justification, is exactly the same.—The questions are stated in order and discussed separately.

ANSWER TO STRICTURE VIII.

(Page 59.)

The internal works of repentance are distinguished from the external, and it is proved against the Censurer, that the internal works of repentance are absolutely necessary to the first justification.

ANSWER TO STRICTURE IX.

(Page 60.)

The instrumentality of faith in the matter of justification is treated of at length.

ANSWER TO STRICTURE X.

(Page 69.)

The mistake of the Censurer in interpreting my words, 'Most of our theologians,' (Harm. I. Diss. iii. 3.) is pointed out.

ANSWER TO STRICTURE XI.

WITH OBSERVATIONS.

(Page 71.)

The opinion of the Censurer on the imputation of the righteousness of Christ, is shewn to be absurd and even dangerous. The imputation, which he defends, 1st, Cannot agree with the forgiveness of sins on God's part. 2ndly, It is entirely incompatible with the necessary requirement of repentance on our part. 3rdly, It takes away also all necessity even of faith, for the obtaining justification: and if it be allowed, it follows necessarily that the justification of a man is prior to his faith. 4thly, and lastly, It entirely overturns the Catholic doctrine of the universal propitiation made by Christ's death for the sins of the whole world, on which the preaching of the Gospel rests. The passages of Scripture which are usually adduced for that imputation are answered. It is proved that no inherent righteousness, properly so called, is acknowledged by the Censurer.

ANSWER TO STRICTURE XII.

(Page 90.)

Our argument against the Solifidians, "Whoever is justified by God through Christ, is acquitted by the law of Christ; but by faith alone, without works, no one is acquitted by the law of Christ," &c., is vindicated from the exceptions and cavils of the Censurer.

ANSWER TO STRICTURE XIII.

(Page 102.)

The opinion of the Censurer, asserting that the primary act or formal cause of justifying faith is trust, strictly so called, is fully refuted.—The true and Catholic doctrine of Christian faith and trust is set forth in four clear theses or conclusions.

ANSWER TO STRICTURE XIV.

(Page 124.)

An argument of ours is supported against the Censurer, which is drawn from that proceeding of God by which He will judge all men in the last day, which is as follows: As every man will be judged by God in the world to come, just in the same way he is justified by God in this life: but by works (not by faith only) every one will be judged by God in the world to come: therefore, &c.—It is shewn that the distinction of the Censurer between a right *to* a thing, and a right *in* a thing, as far as it is applicable to this question, is frivolous and empty.

ANSWER TO STRICTURE XV.

(Page 135.)

Placæus' and the Censurer's system of reconciling the Apostles St. James and St. Paul is examined more accurately, and compared with our own.

ANSWER TO STRICTURE XVI.

(Page 145.)

Our doctrine, that the faith to which justification is attributed in the Scriptures is taken in a complex sense, and embraces hope, love, and good works, is defended against the Censurer. A remarkable passage of Huldrych Zuinglius is adduced for this doctrine.

ANSWER TO STRICTURE XVII.

(Page 155.)

It is shewn how absurd the Censurer's answer is to our arguments concerning a law of perfect obedience. (Harm. II. Diss. vii.)

APPENDIX TO STRICTURE XVII.

(Page 158.)

The question, Whether God has ever imposed a law of most absolute virtue on the posterity of fallen Adam, is treated at length.—The state of the question is explained.—The true and Catholic doctrine on this question is set forth in seven theses.

ANSWER TO STRICTURE XVIII.

(Page 183.)

The quotation from the pseudo-Ambrose, cited by the author of the Harmony, is defended against the Censurer by testimonies from the real St. Ambrose, and St. Augustine.

ANSWER TO STRICTURE XIX.

(Page 184.)

It is proved by many arguments, that the Apostle, when he denies that a sinner can be justified by the law of Moses, does not use this argument, that that law demands the most perfect and absolute virtue, such as no one, not even by the grace of God promised in the Gospel, can perform, as a condition of justification: but rests it quite on another ground, viz. that in that law (under the view in which it is considered by him) no true justification at all, or forgiveness of sins, which looks beyond this life, is granted on any condition.

ANSWER TO STRICTURE XX.

(Page 200.)

The reasonings of the Censurer against what is alleged in the Harmony, in explaining another argument of the Apostle, drawn from the inability of the Mosaic law to deliver a man from the dominion of sin.

ANSWER TO STRICTURE XXI.

(Page 204.)

The assertion of the author of the Harmony, that the law of Moses, in that it promised nothing beyond this life, could not produce in men an ardent, constant, unwearied pursuit of virtue, is vindicated from the Censurer's cavils.—It is shewn that the opinion that eternal life is promised in the Old Testament, was condemned of old by Catholics in Pelagius.

ANSWER TO STRICTURE XXII.

(Page 211.)

The assertion of the author of the Harmony, that the law of Moses, in that it contained temporal promises and threats only, was calculated to engender in men a low and mean spirit and disposition, and one wholly foreign to true and genuine piety, is explained and defended by the authority of St. Augustine, and even the Apostle St. Paul.—An objection is met.

ANSWER TO STRICTURE XXIII.

(Page 215.)

It is proved, by the plainest argument, that the author of the Harmony acknowledges the true and genuine sense of the English Church in the Eleventh Article.—The sense which the Censurer affixes to the Article, is rejected as diametrically opposed not only to the interpretation given by the Church of England herself, but also to Holy Scripture and right reason.

EPILOGUE.

(Page 222.)

INDEX OF

TITLES AND MATTER IN THE APOLOGY.

PREFACE.

(Page 225.)

SECTION I.

ON THE TITLE OF THE BOOK.

(Page 228.)

The invidious charge of religion being innovated on, with which Dr. Tully in the title of his book wished to crush his opponents, removed. Popular charges of Popery and Socinianism, with which he taunts those whom he calls innovators, throughout his book, clearly refuted.

SECTION II.

ON THE PREFACE OF THE BOOK.

(Page 243.)

Dr. Tully's rhetoric, in the very beginning of his book, irrelevant. Dr. Tully undeservedly blames those who thought they ought to abstain from the controversy which he himself is carrying on with such zeal against the author of the Harmony. The great things of Divine truth, for which Dr. Tully considers persons should so earnestly contend, are partly mere trivial distinctions, and partly pernicious doctrines, dreadful to Christian ears. Tragic discourse of Dr. Tully, which he thunders against the Harmonist and the rest of his adversaries, refuted. Dr. Tully declares in vain that he has entered the lists of this controversy unwillingly. He does not observe the law that he himself lays down for his adversaries.

SECTION III.

(ON THE FIRST CHAPTER.)

STATE OF THE QUESTION.

(Page 249.)

State of the question badly defined by the Doctor. True state of the question clearly explained.

SECTION IV.

(ON THE SECOND CHAPTER.)

ON THE OPINION OF THE FATHERS.

(Page 263.)

Dr. Tully falsely attributes to the author of the Harmony, that he had written that most of the Fathers before Augustine, went on his side for the righteousness of works. The author of the Harmony willingly appeals to the tribunal of the Fathers. This to be stated generally, concerning the Fathers, namely, that in all those places where they teach that a man is justified by faith only, they are not speaking of faith as a single virtue, but of faith in its complex sense, or of *fides formata*, as it is opposed (1) to external works, or to the actual righteousness of works; or (2) to works of the natural law, done before and without the knowledge, faith, and grace of the Gospel; or (3) to works of the Mosaic law: or lastly, to meritorious works of whatever kind. The testimonies of Irenæus, Origen, Cyprian, Hilary, Basil the Great, Ambrose, Chrysostom, Augustine, severally answered.

SECTION V.

(ON THE THIRD CHAPTER.)

ON THE JUDGMENT OF THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND.

(Page 275.)

Threefold dishonesty of Dr. Tully noted; namely, his not quoting the decree of the Church of England in the Eleventh Article, as it stands; his being wholly silent on that more diffuse explanation of the Article, contained in the Homily on Salvation, to which the Church, in the Article itself, refers her sons: lastly, his referring the reader to certain scraps of the Homily, and those not faithfully translated by him, and wretchedly distorted by his interpretations. Passages adduced from the Homily on Salvation answered. Our own explanation of the Article confirmed by an illustrious testimony of the very illustrious divine, Richard Field.

SECTION VI.

(ON THE FOURTH CHAPTER.)

ON THE JUDGMENT OF FOREIGN CHURCHES, CALLED REFORMED.

(Page 291.)

The assertion of the author of the Harmony that all the Confessions of the reformed Churches, or at least of the first and best of them, are on his side, defended against Dr. Tully. Dr. Tully in vain blames the author of the Harmony, for saying that the Confession of Augsburg was the most celebrated of all the reformed Confessions, and that the first authors of our Reformation had followed or imitated that Confession. It is proved against Dr. Tully, that the divines of Augsburg taught that true repentance is altogether necessary for a man's justification. The passage quoted by the author of the Harmony, from the Confession of Wurtemburg, explained. The words of the noble Confession of Strasburg vindicated from Dr. Tully's untrue interpretation of them.

SECTION VII.

BEING AN APPENDIX TO THE PRECEDING SECTIONS.

(Page 301.)

Accusation of heterodoxy retorted on the Doctor. It is shewn that Dr. Tully in certain very important points of Christian doctrine, is altogether at variance with the clear definitions of the English, and other of the better reformed, and so of the Catholic Church. Four of his uncatholic dogmas are specially noted: namely, (1.) That repentance or true contrition for sin is in no degree necessary for obtaining the first justification. (2.) That the continuation or preservation of our justification already obtained by faith only, does not at all depend upon the condition of good works to be hereafter performed by us. (3.) That a man who has been once imbued with justifying faith, cannot possibly wholly fall away from the same, and perish everlastingly. (4.) That Christ has made satisfaction, and offered Himself on the cross, for the sins of the elect alone.

SECTION VIII.

ON THE REMAINING CHAPTERS.

(Page 344.)

Certain wonderful sophisms of the Doctor are noted. It is falsely asserted by Dr. Tully against the Harmonist and his friends, that on their view, the Fathers, the Church of England, and all the reformed are Solifidians. Dr. Tully, however, is fairly convicted of Solifidianism. The charge he brings against the Harmonist, that he is playing a part in opposition to the truth, clearly refuted. A certain argument of the author of the Harmony defended against Dr. Tully, which runs thus: In whatever degree St. Paul rejects ritual

and external works as unnecessary, in the same does he admit spiritual as necessary; but he rejects ritual works as unnecessary for justification, &c. The honest confession of the Harmonist, that the Harmony was written when he was very young, very dishonestly bandied about by Dr. Tully. Certain passages from the Harmony quoted unfairly by Dr. Tully, noted. The whole aim of the eleventh chapter of the *Justificatio Paulina*, in which Dr. Tully endeavours to prove that our doctrine of justification is quite in accordance with the papistical, shortly answered. Charge retorted on the Doctor, and it is shewn that Dr. Tully's opinion on justification agrees very nicely with that of the Papists in the point where they are most papistical. Argument of the Harmonist vindicated, in which he had proved that St. James does not deny the sole office of justifying to a false, but to a true faith also, which was, that 'that faith which was in Abraham, was certainly a true faith, and not the shadow of faith:' but the faith itself of Abraham did not avail to justify him without works, &c. Contradiction falsely attributed to the Harmonist. An egregious calumny of the Doctor joined with remarkable dishonesty, noted. Bellarmine's opinion of the merit of good works, compared with that of the Harmonist.

SECTION IX.

ON THE DISSERTATION CONCERNING ST. PAUL'S MEANING IN ROM. 7. FROM VERSE 14.

(Page 360.)

Dr. Tully pretends in vain, 1. That the author of the Harmony has not many of the ancients agreeing with him in his interpretation of this chapter. 2. That nearly if not actually all the Fathers after Pelagius are opposed to the Harmonist. 3. That only one or two modern divines favour our opinion. It is shewn how plainly false all these assertions are. Besides Irenæus, Tertullian, Cyprian, Macarius, Basil, Maximus, Cyril, Origen, Chrysostom, Theodoret, pseudo-Ambrose, Theophylact, Œcumenius, Paulinus, Damascene, Sedulius, other remarkable testimonies are adduced for our opinion, not as yet observed by others, namely, six ancient doctors, Justin Martyr, Clement of Alexandria, Marcus Eremita, St. Dorotheus, St. Pacian, and Ennodius. It is shewn that the interpretation of theologians of the day, with whom Dr. Tully agrees, is very far from the meaning and intention of Augustine. The Greek doctors, even after Augustine, constantly adhered to the primitively received and approved interpretation in the Catholic Church. Nor did all the Latin Fathers, after Augustine, receive his exposition. Amongst the Roman Catholics, Faber Stapulensis, Erasmus, Isidore Clarius, Zeger, Toledo: on our side, Castellio, Musculus, Bucer, Grotius, Vossius, Amyraldus: amongst our countrymen, Jackson, Hammond, Taylor, Farindon and others, favour our interpretation. Dr. Tully in vain objects that our interpretation is opposed to the opinion of the Church of England. Reasons for our exposition taken from the very chapter, and our answers to the arguments of the opposite side, vindicated.

EXAMEN CENSURÆ.

PREFACE OF THE CENSURER.

PREF.

The specious title of this book filled me with desire to procure it; the desire and hope of finding the truth urged me, as soon as I had procured it, eagerly to devour it. But at the first opening of its pages I was displeased with what met my sight; scarcely did I believe my own eyes. I was determined at once to examine the whole accurately. The newness of the doctrine itself took me by surprise; but the bold opposition to the Apostle, worked up with such a mass of argument, astounded me. I could not help noting, as I read the Dissertations from beginning to end, what appeared at variance with Scripture and reason guided by its light. With your leave, most learned Sir, I will speak my mind freely; and these Strictures, my brother, I humbly submit to your consideration, and the judgment of my superiors.

ANSWER TO THE PREFACE.

§ 1. It was not for you, my Censurer, to reproach me with the specious title of my book, when you have lately published a little tract on the same subject (few certainly are its pages, and narrow enough its limits, so small that scarcely have you room to touch on all the chief difficulties of the question, far less to explain them as the subject deserves) which you have embellished with nearly the same title. Which of us has played upon the reader with a specious title, I would willingly refer to an impartial judge.

§ 2. I cannot but wonder what caused you at the first outset of your Strictures to make so much noise about a harmless writing. At the first opening of its pages you say you found something that displeased you; you scarcely believed your own eyes: when you had read the book through attentively,

PREF. you were astounded. Heavens! what have I done? what have I taught? what monstrosity does the book bear with it? The aim, the object of the book, was to shew that good works proceeding from and in union with faith, are a condition (for I would not dare, with you, to speak at all more highly of any virtue of ours—you who attribute to faith in the work of justification an *efficient causality*) necessary to be fulfilled in order that a man may be justified by the Gospel covenant, procured and established by the Blood of Christ his Mediator. This, I contend, is the doctrine of St. James, and I maintain that St. Paul doth no where contradict it. Everywhere do I so openly renounce any merit in our works, that I scarcely acknowledge him to be a Christian, who contends for merit properly so called. In the work of justification and salvation I most willingly attribute every principal effect to the meritorious obedience of Jesus Christ, which was completed by His death. This alone hath satisfied Divine Justice. This alone hath rendered the most holy, most just God propitious to us sinners. This only hath been the cause that God on this best and most favourable condition hath promised us salvation, and that in heaven and for ever, which by no other means could we have obtained. Lastly, I have ever taught, that without the effectual grace and aid of the Holy Spirit, flowing from the side of our crucified Saviour, no man can perform this condition of the Gospel covenant. No anathema do I think can be too hard upon the heresy of Pelagius. But what mean you, when I recur to the praises of God's assisting grace in St. Paul's teaching, till I almost weary you? who would have expected, that for such teaching, I should have been thus shamefully handled, by a Christian, by a Catholic? who would call a man for so thinking, "most shameless, mad, impious, blasphemer," which are the titles you every where bestow upon me? Surely, no sober-minded man will deny, that in this question of justification, the main part of my teaching, at least, is Catholic; but if I have erred in any of the appendages or consequences, (so to speak,)—(which, however, you have not yet proved)—those who feel themselves to be but men, and are not insensible to human infirmities, will, I am sure, forgive me.

§ 3. But I now answer the charge of novelty in doctrine

which you allege against me, not only in the Preface, but repeatedly throughout your Strictures. I have no hesitation in appealing to those who are lovers of antiquity, who alone can be fair judges of what is old, what new doctrine, whether there is aught in the book that you have set yourself to tear piecemeal with accusations, that is at variance with the doctrines of the ancient Catholic Church, whose judgment and consent we are bound by an express canon of our English Church[a] scrupulously to follow in the interpretation of Scripture, and the deduction from thence of doctrines. But all is strange and new to you which agrees not with the arbitrary definitions of the systematizers, from whose stores you seem to have derived all your theology. Hence the wholesome doctrines of the ancients you reject and throw from you as new, while you embrace new doctrines as old. Would that you would learn from the advice of John Fell, that most pious and learned doctor, and one of the chief ornaments of the University of Oxford; who at the end of the Preface to his edition of Clemens Romanus seriously exhorts students of Theology "to keep far—(if, indeed, the saying, *id verum quod primum*, 'what was first is true,' is worthy the credit and estimation of an oracle)—to keep far away from the sluggish and muddy pools of those who would be called 'modern Divines,' and seek the everlasting and clear fountains, holy and full of grace, beyond the credit of gentile theology." The holy man continues: "One may, indeed, expect innovators to follow novelties; but they who love the untainted doctrines of the primitive Church will not as soon give ear to writers of a later age. For, by this most certain sign, and by this most characteristic mark, will they prove themselves the Church's genuine sons, in that they look up with a singular reverence to her most holy Fathers." But why do I confine myself to the ancients? I appeal also to our later Divines. How many names can I recount, 'shining lights' in this our English land, who, before me, fearlessly and without charge of heterodoxy have handed down in their writings the doctrine you impugn, and have openly defended it, against the cries and barkings only of innovators and schismatics? Take heed you drive me not to recount them, PREF.

[a] Collect. Canon. Can. Elizab. de Concionator. p. 19.

PREF. which I fancy you would be little pleased with, and reflect at length, how many and how great men you scathe in attacking me.

§ 4. Most ridiculous certainly is your charge as to my bold contradiction of St. Paul. For I do not contradict him more than St. James himself, that is, not at all. I grant that I have endeavoured (and God knows with the best intention) to reconcile the *apparent* discrepancy, and that one of greatest moment, in the two Apostles' writings; and if in my endeavour to do this I shall have met with the entire disapprobation of learned and pious men, (which many things prevent me from believing, though you so often assert it,) I am not the first, as you are aware, who have failed in the attempt. I am glad, however, that whatever in my Dissertations seems to you to disagree with the Scriptures and reason, you noted in the course of reading; for hence I may fairly conclude that nothing remains, after Aristarchus' judgment, that is opposed to Scripture or reason. Certainly, the objections you bring forward in your animadversions either miss the point altogether, or are supported by the most trifling or no arguments at all. Not to mention the number of paragraphs, and even entire chapters, in the Dissertations, in which the whole force and strength of my argument lies, which you either pass by in the most profound silence, or touch upon as slightly as possible. That these things are not bravado, but truth, they know who have compared my Dissertations with your Animadversions on the same.

§ 5. You have full permission then, my Censurer, to use your plainness of speech, and say freely what you think, though, as becomes an honest man and a gentleman, without abuse and slander, from which, if you had abstained in writing, you would have more nearly (even in the judgment of your own conscience) performed the duty, which you profess, of brotherly love. To your Strictures, however, which you have put before me for my consideration, I have paid serious attention; and I find nothing noted by you in your animadversions that I need regret having said. However, you must not expect me in my answer to follow you step for step; I would not so abuse the patience of my reader, or lay out good hours so badly. For how many of your censures are but

mere calumnies! how many bare assertions do they contain without any proof! how frequently is the reader wearied out with the tiresome repetition of the same things! and, therefore, whatever is to the point in any way, and that only, have I brought once for all under examination. Lastly, whatever I may have written, either in this or other books, most humbly and most willingly do I submit it to the judgment of our holy mother the English Church; her to whom I have hitherto devoted myself in all filial obedience, and to whom, while I live, by God's help I will devote myself. PREF.

STRICTURE I.

ON INTRODUCTION.

In the introduction of my book, the method I proposed to myself, of treating the subject which I had undertaken to explain, as most convenient, was this:—1st. Taking the conclusion of the second chapter of St. James, briefly to explain its meaning, and then support the truth of it by some arguments. 2ndly. To take St. Paul's Epistles, and shew clearly that he agrees with St. James on the subject of justification. Here, at the margin of the book, you write as follows: "I do not see the reason of this method. It is unfair that one passage of St. James should be made the measure of the many lengthened discussions on which St. Paul has entered, in which he uses various, and those powerful arguments, to shew that a sinner is justified by faith without works, opposing faith to works in the obtaining of justification. It is unfair that that text should be held up as a light and a torch to the writings of St. Paul, as though to shew light upon what was more obscure. Tertullian says, 'Things which are rare ought to be explained by things of oftener occurrence.'" adv. Prax.

ANSWER TO STRICTURE I.

§ 1. In the opening of your attack you give me evidence enough, my Censurer, how unfair an adversary you are likely to prove in the course of the conflict; you object even to my very

STRIC. I. plan of proceeding. How unreasonable is this lust for objection! for if I rightly and fairly explain the teaching of the two Apostles, what have you to complain of in my plan? What matters it, whether I begin my Dissertations with St. James or St. Paul, provided I do no wrong to either? But you say, "It is unfair that one passage of St. James should be made the measure of the many lengthened discussions on which St. Paul has entered." Be it so. What matters it, if I first, by many and clear arguments drawn from Scripture, establish the conclusion of St. James, and then passing on to St. Paul, shew his agreement with St. James, by solid arguments drawn (if I may so speak) from the very heart of his Epistles. I confess, indeed, that I think that St. Paul's meaning may be clearly enough drawn from the single discourse of St. James in his second chapter; and it was on this account that in another part of my writings I said it was far more reasonable in this controversy to interpret St. Paul from St. James, than St. James from St. Paul. I see, indeed, that you are greatly offended with this; you ought, however, to have attended to the grounds on which I support my opinion; and these I have determined to repeat here for the sake of the reader, and vindicate them from your cavils.

Harm. Apost. II. Diss. iv. 2. p. 57.

§ 2. My first argument then is, that St. James's discourse is clear and perspicuous, and his words so express, that he who doubts their meaning may be deservedly said to be seeking difficulties where there are none; on the other hand, the argument of St. Paul is obscure, involved and intricate. In the interpretation of Scripture it is a well known rule, that the obscurer passages must be explained by the clearer. Here, either from ignorance or spitefulness, you carp at what I said about the perspicuity of St. James, asking, "Had all the learned and pious men, who have doubted of the meaning of St. James's words, nothing else to do but look for difficulties, where there were none?" I answer: that the reason that those pious and learned men doubted of the meaning of St. James's words was a preconceived opinion about justification by faith only, as a single virtue, which they had drawn from a misunderstanding of St. Paul's words, (it being no difficult thing, from the obscurity of his writings, to mistake

that Apostle's meaning, unless the drift of his argument be carefully attended to). In order to maintain this opinion, and at the same time to reconcile the two Apostles, there was no stone they did not turn: and convinced that they had hit the meaning of St. Paul's argument, they laboured by every invention to do away the seeming opposition of St. James. Now, barring the unpopularity which great names cast upon a truth otherwise most evident, I appeal to the conscience of any pious and learned reader, who is free from prejudice, whether St. James's language be not clear, perspicuous and express? Certainly, in the Apostle's conclusion, that "a man is justified by works, and not by faith only," there is not a word, not a term, (to use the barbarous language of the schoolmen), the meaning of which is not most evident from the context in the Apostle's discourse. Do you ask of what justification St. James speaks? It is plain that he is not speaking of the declaration only of a man's righteousness before men, but of his justification also in the sight of God. For he speaks plainly of that justification by which a man is made "the friend of God," (ver. 23,) and by which righteousness is imputed to him by God, (in the same verse,) and lastly, by which a right to salvation is given him, (ver. 14). Have you any doubt of what faith the Apostle is speaking? He means true faith, perfect of its kind, such as was Abraham's, (vv. 21, 22); and he says, that according to the Gospel covenant it is not sufficient without works for our obtaining that justification. Of what works St. James is to be understood, there can be no question; he speaks expressly of works proceeding from faith and the grace of the Gospel, or works co-operating with faith and perfecting it, (ver. 22); and thus I have with reason affirmed that St. James's language is clear and perspicuous: and this is plainly confessed by those of our opponents who (with bold and impious presumption) ventured to thrust out St. James's Epistle from the canon of Scripture. Why did they do so? Because, not weighing the arguments of St. Paul with the care that they require, they were led to think that a man is justified by faith alone; meaning by that expression the single virtue of faith, as distinct from the other virtues of the Gospel. Fully aware that St. James's reasoning was diametrically opposed to this

Vid. Harm. Apost. II. Diss. i. 6, 7. p. 45, 46.

STRIC. their rashly conceived opinion, and seeing that his doctrine could by no ingenuity be reconciled with the opinion they had formed: unable to untie this Gordian knot, as it seemed to them, they assayed to cut it, by calling in question or openly rejecting the authority of that Epistle which bears the name of St. James, as I have observed in the Introduction of my book. Thus much, then, of St. James's perspicuity.

§ 3. With my remarks as to St. Paul's obscurity you are well nigh driven to madness. Thus you write at p. 57 of my book: "It is impiety to try to prove St. Paul to be obscure, and to raise and spread clouds, because you must have them. This Dissertation is but too like the smoke which arose out of 'the bottomless pit, and darkened the sun and the air.'" Who does not rather here perceive you breathing out the smoke of your anger and indignation, (look you to it from what pit it has arisen)—but stay! beware, lest while you are falsely accusing me of impiety, you convict yourself of real impiety. If *he* must be an impious man who has called St. Paul's discourse obscure, then were Origen, Basil the Great, Gregory of Nazianzus, Chrysostom, Jerome, Augustine, and very many other most illustrious doctors in the ancient Church, all impious men; for they hesitated not to say the very same thing. A passage of Origen is quoted in which he remarks that "some parts of the Scriptures *seem not to have regular composition and consequence,* nor to follow one from the other, and this is most observable in the prophetical and apostolical writings, and among the latter in the Epistle to the Romans especially:" in which he says, "*what is said of the law is said in different ways, and in reference to different points; so that it seems as though St. Paul in that Epistle did not attain the object he proposed to himself.*" This saying of Origen's has been approved by the holy Fathers Basil the Great and Gregory Nazianzen, inasmuch as they made the collection of passages from Origen, called the Philocalia, "being selections of use to the studious," as Gregory himself says in his Epistle to Theodoret bishop of Tyana. Chrysostom on the seventh chapter to the Romans, says, "You see unless we trace his words with the care and caution they require, and keep our eye on the drift of the Apostle, ten

Rev. 9. 2.

Philocal. cap. 9.

μὴ ἔχειν σύνταξιν μηδὲ ἀκολουθίαν.

Epist. 87.

[Hom. xiii. 1. p. 558.]

thousand absurdities will ensue." St. Jerome in his reply to the eighth question of Algasias, which comes out of the same chapter, says in round terms, "The whole of this passage of the Apostle, both in what precedes and in what follows, nay the whole of his Epistle to the Romans, is involved in extreme obscurities: and if I wished to explain every thing, I should have to write not one book, but a number of large volumes." And the like of this you may find constantly in the same answer to the questions of Algasias. Lastly, this obscurity deterred even St. Augustine from finishing the exposition of the Epistle to the Romans which he had begun, as he himself bears witness.

STRIC. —I.— [Epist. 121. vol. i. p. 870.] Lib. i. Retract. cap. 25.

§ 4. Farther, if it be an impious proceeding to say that St. Paul's Epistles are obscure, (I shudder at stating the blasphemy,) it was an impious proceeding in the Apostle St. Peter, who says plainly that there are "some things hard to be understood" in those Epistles. That St. Peter refers here principally to St. Paul's argument on justification by faith, as opposed to the works of the Law, has been the judgment of most learned men; and very satisfactory grounds for this opinion I have given in II. Diss. iv. 2. p. 57. To those remarks may be added the following. The best interpreters agree that the Epistle which is called the second of St. Peter was written against certain impious heretics of that age, who came out of the school of Simon Magus; and this is sufficiently evident from the number of marks and hints that discover themselves in the Epistle. Now every one is aware that among other doctrines horrifying to Christian ears which the followers of Simon contended for, was this heretical doctrine, that good works are in no way necessary for a man's justification or salvation. On this point I will put before you two very remarkable passages of Irenæus. One, where recounting Simon's impious heresies he says that that first-born of the devil taught that "they who trusted in him and his Helena, were free to do as they pleased: for that men were saved according to her favour, not by works of righteousness;" whence by the way you will observe that they who taught that men were justified or saved (for there certainly was no difference acknowledged between the two terms, at least by the ancients) otherwise than by

2 Pet. 3. 16.

Lib. i. c. 20. [c. 23, 3. p. 29.]

STRIC. I.

good works were held in the primitive Church to be heretics. The second passage is where he thus describes Valentinus' opinion on man's justification: (Valentinus was one who merely gave a new dress to the Simonian heresy). "Carnal men have carnal training, and by means of works and mere faith they are strengthened, but have not perfect knowledge: and such they say are we who are of the Church; and hence it is they declare good works are necessary for us, since otherwise we cannot be saved; but they teach that they will be entirely and without doubt saved, not by means of works, but because they are spiritual by nature." In these words of Irenæus every thing is plain, except one doubt of the meaning of the words "by mere faith:" but the difficulty is easily got rid of; for "mere faith" is not opposed to works, (for the Valentinians derided the Catholics for saying they were strengthened by this faith in conjunction with works,) but to "perfect knowledge," to which those most shameless heretics pretended. They boasted (as is plain from the words just preceding the quotation in Irenæus) that they were already perfected, and that not by a slender faith, but by an immediate and certain knowledge they had attained to all the Divine mysteries. However, it is evident from this passage that Christians of that age, who adhered to the doctrines of the Church, held that a man was strengthened not by faith only, but by works and faith together: (what Catholics understood by these words a thoughtful reader will readily guess:) that heretics on the contrary taught that a man could be justified and saved if not by a bare faith, without doubt by a perfect knowledge without good works. No one can doubt that the defence for this heresy of theirs was sought from the discourses of St. Paul; particularly as in other cases, without any colour of pretence, as is evident from Irenæus, they brought forward the testimony of St. Paul to support their ravings. If this were so, no one will doubt that St. Peter referred primarily to these men, when he said that there were some things hard to be understood in St. Paul's Epistles, "which men that were unlearned and unstable did wrest to their own destruction."

Lib. i. c. 1. p. 26. edit. Feuardent. [c. 6. p. 29.]

διαπίστεως ψιλῆς.

γνώσει τελείᾳ.

βεβαιοῦσθαι.

§ 5. From all these things it is most evident that it is not an impious proceeding to attribute obscurity to St. Paul,

especially in the arguments he has entered into on the subject of justification. But to be brief: some causes of this obscurity have been stated by very learned interpreters. The first is the frequent abruptness in St. Paul's style, frequent parentheses, not so much flowing on in a premeditated order, as borne on by a sort of divine impulse. Thus Irenæus of old observed; "that the Apostle introduces many hyperbata, on account of the rapidity of his style, and the impetuousness of the spirit which is in him, is discoverable from many things." The second cause is, that opinions of the Hebrew doctors, ancient and modern, are rather referred to, as being well known among those to whom he was writing, than fully given out. To which may be added, that he does not unravel the objections of Jews, which he was answering, but strikes through them with a blow—as known to those to whom he was writing. Many other causes of obscurity might be added, had I room for them. As you, however, have better eyes than all other men, and think you see so clearly through St. Paul's discourses, allow me to address you in the words of Origen to Celsus. "First make plain St. Paul's Epistle to the Romans, and having carefully considered the meaning of each expression therein, shew that you understand his words." When you have done this, all learned men, I think, will willingly concede you the palm among the interpreters of Holy Scripture. And so much for our first argument, in which it is proved clearly that it is more reasonable to interpret St. Paul from St. James, than St. James from St. Paul.

STRIC. I.

iii. 7.

Lib. iii. p. 122. edit. Cantab.

§ 6. My next argument, by which I aimed at establishing the same, is drawn from tradition and the opinion of the ancients; they thought that St. James's Epistle (where he speaks of justification) was written expressly against men who had misinterpreted St. Paul's Epistles, and asserted that faith alone without good works was sufficient for a man's justification or salvation. The truth of this tradition, indeed, is sufficiently attested and evidenced by the fact, apart from the authority of the ancients. Otherwise, I ask, whence could that error of justification by faith, as a single virtue, without works, have arisen among the Christians against whom St. James argues, except from the misunder-

STRIC. I. standing of St. Paul's arguments? You could not even imagine a more probable origin of the error. Nothing however can be fairer, nothing better, than to interpret St. Paul's Epistles by comparison with a discourse of St. James, which he wrote with the design of putting an end to false interpretations of the same Epistles. Here you surely have nothing to object to in the argument itself. Only because I said, "what adds a farther degree of probability is, that St. James uses the same example of Abraham to prove 'works are necessary for justification,' from which St. Paul deduces that 'man is justified by faith without works'"—in reference to these words, I say, you address me thus; "What do you mean? do you think that St. James wrote with the intention of contradicting St. Paul? to what purpose do you raise this suspicion?" But, Sir, in return, let me ask what do you mean by promising your reader censures on my book, and then setting before him this trifling, this sheer riff-raff? Tell me, do you really seriously think that by those words I meant that St. James wrote with the intention of contradicting St. Paul? that *I* meant this, I who wrote the whole of my second Dissertation, not a short one, with a design of shewing that in the controversy of justification neither St. James contradicted St. Paul nor St. Paul St. James one whit? I who have shewn that the example of Abraham was rightly and appositely brought forward by both the Apostles? Consider again my words, where, after much said in exposition of St. Paul's discourse on Abraham in Romans, chapter the fourth, among other things I subjoin the following conclusion: "In addition to this, the agreement of St. Paul with St. James is clearly seen from this, namely, that from the same example of Abraham, the former concludes 'a man to be justified without works,' the latter 'by works:' for St. Paul speaks of Abraham 'according to the flesh,' such as he was before the call; St. James, when blessed by grace and the Divine call. The former denies justification to his works done before faith, while the latter attributes it to works proceeding from faith. Here, then, is no contradiction between the Apostles."

[II. Diss. iv. 2. p. 57.]

Rom. 4.

II. Diss. xii. 27. p. 159.

Think again over these words, and be ashamed that such a remark, shall I call it so futile or so malicious, should have

fallen from your pen. I will only add that my observation which you object to is borrowed from St. Augustine, who thus speaks: "Since the Apostle Paul, saying that a man is justified by faith without works, has been misunderstood by men, who were led to suppose that if they once believed in Christ, although they still did evil and lived in iniquity and lewdness, they could be saved through faith: this passage of this Epistle (meaning St. James chapter the second) explains the meaning of St. Paul and shews how it is to be understood, and it is on this account that he rather chooses the example of Abraham, saying that 'faith which worketh not righteousness is vain,' as St. Paul had used the same example of Abraham to prove that 'a man is justified by faith without the works of the law.'" The rest that St. Augustine says is well worth reading. STRIC. I. Lib. de 83 Quæstionibus, qu. 76. [vol. vi. p. 67.]

§ 7. And these were the arguments by which I thought it sufficiently proved that it was more agreeable to reason to interpret St. Paul from St. James, than St. James from St. Paul. But to all these arguments you oppose the well known rule of Tertullian, that things which are rare ought to be explained by things of oftener occurrence, and you remind me again of the same rule in your remarks on chap. iv. of second Dissertation, p. 57. Under this rule you seem to assume that there is one passage only of St. James, and that confined within a very few verses; whereas St. Paul's discussions on the same argument are both many and lengthened, and hence you would draw your conclusion, in opposition to mine, that therefore it is more reasonable to interpret St. James from St. Paul, than St. Paul from St. James. But here you impose a gross fallacy upon yourself and your reader, and mistake much in your calculations, for the passage of St. James, which you call single, stands supported, so to speak, by the whole army of the Scriptures: to wit, that there is need not of faith only, but of repentance also, (which includes the whole duty, as prescribed in the Gospel, of a sinner returning to God,) that a sinner may be accounted and dealt with as righteous through the sacrifice of the Mediator, with the remission of all his sins, and the bestowal of the right to salvation and eternal life, (which only is the doctrine of St. James,) the writings both of the

STRIC. I. Old and New Testament openly and constantly declare. This is what I remarked in the Harmony, at the beginning of the argument, where I endeavoured to establish St. James's statement by other testimonies from Scripture. My words are as follows: "For it is not to be supposed that St. James hath advanced any paradox or opinion peculiar to himself. What he says are the words of the Holy Spirit, which are every where consistent. The Prophets, the Apostles, Christ Himself, all give the same evidence. This doctrine occupies almost every page of Holy Scripture; and I will venture to say that scarce any other can be produced out of those holy volumes which is so distinctly laid down or so often taught." What if St. Paul himself constantly and clearly asserts and defends the same doctrine, and that in the very Dissertations out of which you and many others endeavour to build up the contrary, as I have shewn largely and plainly? All your boasting of the many and long dissertations of St. Paul to the contrary is just nothing. That the sober and truth-loving reader may convince himself of this, I wish him to weigh attentively these two points: First, that a man is justified by faith without works, is taught in so many terms by no inspired writer but St. Paul: to be convinced of the truth of this remark, the reader need only consult a Concordance, when his own eyes will assure him of the fact. Secondly, that a man is justified by faith without works, is no where taught, even by St. Paul, except in the way of controversy and in the dispute in which he was engaged against the enemies of the Gospel, who contended that a man was justified *otherwise* than by the Gospel covenant, or at least *not by that alone;* viz., in his Epistles to the Churches of Rome and Galatia, where he is speaking too to Jews, and trying to drive them from their trust in the Mosaic covenant. The truth of this remark also, may be shewn by the means which I pointed out above. To this observation I would add, as consequent on it, that St. Paul does not oppose faith to the other virtues of the Gospel, (nothing would be farther from his purpose,) but by the word faith he means the whole condition of the Gospel covenant, opposed to those grounds and conditions by which his adversaries taught that man is justified whether without the performance of the Gospel

I. Diss. ii. 2. p. 11.

Harm. II. Diss. iv. 5—10.

Acts 13. 38, 39.

covenant, or in connection with it. But this is by the way; we have explained it fully in the Harmony, and we will repeat it again in this Examen in a more convenient place. Meanwhile, from these two observations compared with those which we mentioned on the constant tenor of Scripture, it is most evident that Tertullian's rule, that "the fewer passages of Scripture ought to be explained by those of more frequent occurrence," makes for our side; and hence it would necessarily follow, (if other arguments were wanting,) that it is more reasonable to interpret St. Paul from St. James, than St. James from St. Paul: q. e. d. STRIC. I.

STRICTURE II.

ON I. DISS. i. 4. p. 7.

Here in the exposition of the remarkable passage, Acts 13. 38, 39, you carp at my explaining 'believers in Christ' by 'those endowed with a perfected faith.' Your words run thus: "I most willingly fall in with this explanation of St. Paul's meaning, but do not like the phrase 'perfected faith.' Afterwards, speaking with the schoolmen who treated the work of justification confusedly, and shamefully corrupted the Gospel doctrine, you assert that faith is perfected by love: neither logically nor theologically. Faith is, in the judgment of the Apostle, distinct from love. Love is no more the form of faith than of hope, or the fear of God, or repentance." fides formata.

ANSWER TO STRICTURE II.

You go on as you began. You here again betray your miserable habit of objecting, even going out of your way to pull to pieces a most innocent expression. The phrase, however, 'perfected faith,' which suits not your taste, was not disapproved by the worthy Bucer, the chief divine among the first reformers. He commended to others the phrase 'we are justified by perfected faith' as at once agreeable to truth, and most fitted to preserve peace: and rebuked those Protestants who in this question were offended with the truth, as fide formatâ justificamur.

STRIC. II. we observed in II. Diss. ii. 8. p. 53, where also I firmly established this phrase from the very words of St. James. I here repeat them, because as usual you pass them over in silence, thinking you have done enough, if you croak your usual (non placet) "it does not please me," though against ever so great authority and plain reason. But listen—if you cannot bear the phrase 'perfected faith,' why do you so often use in your own remarks the phrase 'living faith,' for between these phrases there is little or no difference. It is childish (to say no worse) to object to a phrase used by another, while you are constantly yourself using a phrase very similar, and which comes to exactly the same thing.

fidem charitate formatam esse.

§ 2. What most of all seems to have displeased you, is that I afterwards assert that 'faith is perfected by love.' Now a truce to all skirmishings—allow me to put this question before you, to be deliberately and freely discussed, Whether love is rightly said to be the form[b] of justifying faith? I say it is, you deny it. To understand, however, the state of the question, we must first of all observe that love is not said to be the 'form' of 'faith,' as though it had any thing to do with its 'essence,' or properly speaking, formed it, since one habit of the soul is not the subject of another, but because an act of faith is so far perfected and formed through love, as to be accepted by God according to the Gospel covenant, and be available for man's justification and salvation. I had remarked this in I. Diss. iv. 5. p. 25. "I do not at all doubt but that love may be rightly called the form of justifying faith; I say expressly of justifying faith, because it is allowed that faith considered by itself has its own form; but that faith which and as far as it justifies, must necessarily be rendered complete by true love." It is useless then to remind us that faith by the Apostle's decision is a virtue distinct from love, as though any man in his senses had ever denied that. But as regards myself you know what I think: viz., that faith and love are virtues distinct even in the subject, so that you may find faith, and that perfect in its kind, in a man who has no love. Still, if any man in the above sense said that 'love was the form of faith,' or that 'faith was informed by love,' he would speak quite logically, as well as

[b] i. e. that which makes it what it is.—Ed.

theologically—logically, because as the form is the cause by which a thing is what it is, so justifying faith becomes justifying through love, according to the Gospel covenant; otherwise according to that covenant it would justify no man, nor would he talk un-theologically or inconformably with Scripture; for what else does St. Paul say in the well known passage in Gal. 5. 6, "in Christ Jesus, neither circumcision availeth any thing, nor uncircumcision, but faith which worketh (or is actuated or wrought) by love." ἀλλὰ πίστις δι' ἀγάπης ἐνεργουμένη.

§ 3. I have often quoted the passage in my Dissertations, but I may perhaps be allowed nevertheless to throw some fresh and fuller light upon it. The participle *ἐνεργουμένη*, though it is of the middle voice, I said must be here taken in a passive sense, and consequently *πίστις δι' ἀγάπης ἐνεργουμένη* must be translated 'faith which is perfected or brought to its effect through love.' In fact you scarce find the word *ἐνεργεῖσθαι* elsewhere in an active sense, even in the classics; it almost always means what we should translate in Latin by *agi, agitari, exerceri, effici, perfici*, or something of the sort in a passive sense. Whence those possessed by a devil, driven, harassed, and as it were 'informed,' (or receiving a character,) are called *energumeni*. Instances of the passive signification occur frequently in St. Paul's Epistles. Rom. 7. 5, "the motions of sins, which were by the law, did work (*ἐνηργεῖτο*, were brought or perfected) in our members." So Tertullian renders the passage, and the meaning is plain—"The motions of sins, i. e. the motives, appetites, and desires to sin, which exist and are roused by the law, were exercised and actively completed in our members." So 2 Cor. 1. 6, "for your consolation and salvation, which is effectual in the enduring," where the sense does not admit an active signification; whence Chrysostom remarks expressly that St. Paul said not *ἐνεργούσης*, 'which worketh,' but *ἐνεργουμένης*, 'which is worked,' (or wrought). So 2 Cor. 4. 12, "death *ἐνεργεῖται* in us, but life in you," where I marvel that our interpreters have rendered 'death worketh in us.' For what is the meaning of the words here? It is evident from the context, that the real meaning of the Apostle is the following: By the preaching of the Gospel, death is wrought in us, (i. e. we die daily for the Gospel,)

I. Diss. iv. 5. p. 25.

ἐνεργούμενοι.

de Resurrectione Carnis.

STRIC. II. while by the same preaching of the Gospel, in you, who have no troubles on its account, life is wrought, spiritual and eternal. In these passages it is plain that the verb *ἐνεργεῖσθαι* cannot be suitably taken in any other than a passive sense; and moreover in all the other places, where some have thought an active signification absolutely necessary, a passive signification suits best. In Eph. 3. 20, *κατὰ τὴν δύναμιν τὴν ἐνεργουμένην ἐν ἡμῖν*, "according to the power that worketh in us," or 'is wrought or perfected in us;' for he is speaking of the grace of God that the faithful had already experienced, and brings that forward as an argument, on which the faithful might rely for security as to the grace of God for the future. So Coloss. 1. last verse, *κατὰ τὴν ἐνέργειαν αὐτοῦ τὴν ἐνεργουμένην ἐν ἐμοὶ ἐν δυνάμει*, "according to His working which worketh in me mightily," or 'which is wrought (or exercised, or perfected) in me in power.' So 1 Thess. 2. 13, *λόγον Θέου, ὃς ἐνεργεῖται ἐν ὑμῖν τοῖς πιστεύουσι*, the "word of God which effectually worketh also (or 'which is perfected') in you that believe." The word of God is then said *ἐνεργεῖσθαι*, or to be 'perfected' in a man, when it attains the end (and effect) appointed to it, viz. the obedience of faith. Similarly also 2 Thess. 2. 7, "The mystery of iniquity," *ἤδη ἐνεργεῖται*, "doth already work," or 'is already being wrought,' or 'begins to be wrought;' so that there is no necessity here for the active voice. Lastly, James 5. 16, "The effectual fervent prayer of a righteous man (*ἐνεργουμένη*, or the prayer 'actuated and impelled by a heavenly warmth and force') availeth much."

§ 4. And so to return to the passage before us, *πίστις δι' ἀγάπης ἐνεργουμένη* is 'faith wrought upon, moved, animated, perfected by love,' and this is no new interpretation. Tertullian thus quotes the passage, "faith which is perfected by love." He is supported by the Syriac interpreter, whose authority has always been high among the learned. This being established, I ask how St. Paul's phrase, *πίστις δι' ἀγάπης ἐνεργούμενη*, differs from the phrase which you so much object to, 'faith perfected by love.' Surely the difference is so slight, that one might pass for a very fair version of the other. But we do not rest on the phrase alone; the aim and meaning of the passage prove what we are maintain-

contra Marc. 5. 4.

fides charitate formata.

ing, that faith is perfected and formed (receives its character) through love thus far, viz.:—that without love it is of no avail or profit to a man's justification and salvation, which is all we mean when we say that faith is 'perfected by love,' as I have before told you. But how plain is this from St. Paul's words! The old interpreters, Greek as well as Latin, remarked on this passage, (and the remark is obvious enough,) that as St. Paul restricts the faith in Christ Jesus that is of any avail, by adding, 'which is perfected by love,' he plainly intimates that there is no faith which, without love in Christ Jesus, that is, according to the Gospel covenant, is of any avail to a man's justification and salvation; but that 'faith perfected by love' (as the great Apostle speaks) is every thing in Christianity, or is all that the Gospel demands. The famous passage of Ignatius, a disciple of the Apostles, and a partaker of their mysteries, which I have prefixed to my Harmony, would supply the place of a commentary (were there need of one) on these words of the Apostle. "Ye miss of nothing if ye have perfectly toward Christ Jesus faith and love, which are the beginning and end of life; faith the beginning, love the end. But the two being in union are of God, and every thing else toward good living follows them." The meaning of these words, which briefly and clearly express the whole of the doctrine which I defend, is plain: The beginning of Gospel righteousness is faith: the completion of it is love: these two united render a man in Christ Jesus, i. e. according to the Gospel covenant, τέλειον, 'perfect,' i. e. accepted by God unto eternal salvation. Every thing else, which any way appertains to a holy life and the practice of good works, necessarily follows and depends upon and flows from these. This is taught elsewhere most clearly by the same Apostle. "Though I have all faith and have not charity, I am nothing;" to wit, as the form gives the being in natural things, so love gives faith a being in its acceptance with God; and accordingly a man, whatever be his faith, if he be without love, is as though he existed not as regards justification and salvation. We have vindicated the passage from some frivolous objections at great length II. Diss. iv. 6. p. 59.

STRIC. II.

charitate formatam.

ad Eph. 14. p. 15.

1 Cor. 13. 2.

§ 5. Your last assertion, that love is no more the form of 'faith' than of 'hope,' or 'the fear of God,' or 'repentance,'

STRIC. II.

is, for once, a true one. Doubtless love is the form of all the other virtues in the same way as it is of faith; inasmuch as there is no virtue which is not perfected and informed by love, so far as that thus it becomes accepted by God, and available towards a man's salvation. Hence in my Dissertations I said, "If there be any universal virtue, which fills, as it were, all the rest with goodness, and gives them their value and importance, that certainly is charity, the true love of God and our neighbour, from which whatever arises, will at last be grateful and pleasing to God." Elsewhere I say "that love is that virtue, which in the matter of salvation, God chiefly regards, and which only, according to the gracious covenant of God, attracts salvation by a necessary connection." At this you raise a monstrous cry, you declare "your mind was horrified, as you read this new doctrine." But as I have already remarked, any thing is new to you which you have not met with in your systematizers. The doctrine which you call 'new,' and at which you are so dreadfully horrified, is St. Augustine's and Prosper's opinion. In the book of Sentences, extracted from the works of St. Augustine by Prosper, the seventh is this: "The love of God and our neighbour is the peculiar and special virtue of pious and holy men, since all the other virtues may be shared by bad as well as good men." If there is no virtue but love, in which bad men have share with holy men, it is plain that love is that virtue, which God especially regards in the matter of salvation &c. Moreover, if faith itself be imperfect by itself, and is of no avail to man's salvation unless δι' ἀγάπης ἐνεργουμένη perfected by love, (which has been already clearly proved,) it is evident how much more this may be affirmed of all the other virtues; and therefore what St. Paul says of faith, that 'without love it profiteth nothing,' he extends to the other virtues also, not only to knowledge and prophecy, but also to alms-giving and even martyrdom. That the Apostle had this in view, when, after the enumeration of various virtues, he bids the Colossians "above all things to put on love or charity which is the bond of perfectness," has been well observed by Isidorus Clarius, who writes thus on the passage: "Love," says he, "is nothing else than that which collecteth all good things into one; for it is that which makes

I. Diss. vi. 8. p. 37.

II. Diss. ii. 7. p. 53.

inter Op. August. vol. x. Append. p. 223.

1 Cor. 13. 3.

σύνδεσμον τῆς τελειότητος. Col. 3. 14.

every thing else to be good." How plainly does the Apostle say this in Rom. 13. 10, and Gal. 5. 14, where he calls 'love the fulfilling of the law!' Hence it is most evident that love is (as we have said) an universal virtue which answers to every Divine commandment, and without which no commandment of God can be rightly observed. The Apostle speaks indeed directly in those passages of love to one's neighbour; but the love of God is included in the love of one's neighbour, as cause in the effect: and as the love of one's neighbour fulfils all the commands relative to our neighbour; so the love of God fulfils all the commands relative to God Himself. Lastly, Christ Himself has most clearly determined the point of this controversy, (and would that poor miserable men could give us leave to hear His voice, and abide by His decision!) when He said in express words, that "on these two commandments hang all the law and the prophets," viz.: "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart &c.," and, "Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself." Mat. 22. 35 to 40 inclus.

STRIC. II. πλήρωμα τοῦ νόμου.

If, however, any one after so clear arguments have any doubt on the subject, may I ask him seriously and thoughtfully to follow me through each virtue mentioned by you, 'hope, the fear of God, and repentance,' and he will see that there is not one of these which does not stand in need of love, for its perfection and form, so far as it is to be accepted with God. Let us begin with 'hope.' This virtue, as distinguished from faith, involves in its very idea the notion of love; its difference from faith consisting in this, that the former is carried on by desire towards the object, which the latter apprehends by a bare assent; and this desire is charity or love. This may be more fully shewn thus: As we hope for nothing which we do not know and believe, and knowledge therefore and faith (or belief) must precede hope; so we hope for nothing which we do not love, as St. Augustine testifies and our own reason confirms. Whence it similarly follows that love precedes hope, and a love by which God is preferred before all things. For as hope is not without love, so the hope of the highest good, as such, (which alone avails to salvation, and of which alone we are now speaking,) cannot be without love of the highest good, as such, i. e. above all things; and this is Christian love. As regards 'the fear of

Enchir. c. 8. vol. vi. p. 198.

STRIC. II. God,' it is evident the fear of God without the love of Him is the fear of a 'servant' not of a 'son;' but filial fear, which alone is available to salvation, and which is called by the schoolmen by other names, 'holy, chaste, ingenuous, friend-like, reverential,' is that from which a man fears to offend God, and through the offence to be separated from God, as his greatest Good. This fear makes a man abstain from sin, not from the fear of hell only, but also from the love of virtue and justice. This fear not only keeps a restraint upon the hand, but is lord also of the heart. On the other hand, servile fear keeps the hand indeed from the perpetration of the evil, but in no way corrects the desire to sin. Lastly, of the third virtue you mentioned, 'repentance,' it is equally evident. Repentance strictly taken as here, and distinct from all other virtues, is grief for the commission of sins. But this grief without love is only 'attrition,' (*attritio*, as the schoolmen say,) not 'contrition,' (*contritio*,) and so does not avail to salvation. 'Contrition,' or true sorrow for sins, is that from which a man grieves for his sin, not only because of the punishment due to him on account thereof, but also because it is an offence against God, (God, I say, the highest Good.) And therefore a sincere hatred of sin accompanies this grief, as also a true love of God and righteousness: whence St. Augustine saith "nothing but the hatred of sin and the love of God makes a sure repentance."

amicalis.

Serm. 7. de Tempore.

§ 7. From all these things you will at length, I hope, understand, that I have not used the phrase *fides formata*, 'perfected faith,' or said that 'faith was perfected by love,' without good reason. If, however, you still object to these phrases, we will for the future, in argument with you, use only St. Paul's phrase, *πίστις δι' ἀγάπης ἐνεργουμένη*, or St. James's *πίστις ἐξ ἔργων τελειωθεῖσα*, for I take no delight in empty disputes about words.

STRICTURE III.

ON I. DISS. i. 5. p. 8.

I here contend, in opposition to Grotius' opinion, for the true meaning of the word *δικαιοῦν* as it is used in the Scriptures in this question, using this argument: "The word

'justify,' both in St. Paul and St. James, has exactly the same force as, 'to reckon a reward,' 'to impute righteousness,' and 'to impute for righteousness.' Now it is well understood that imputation denotes the act of God regarding a man as just, not making him just; and this Grotius neither can nor will deny." Your remarks upon these words are as follows. "The learned man has well laid down, and proved satisfactorily, that justification is the accounting of a man righteous who is righteous otherwise than by the mere decision of the judge; God justifies him who is unrighteous, but yet who is partaker of Christ's righteousness through faith. He makes, however, a strange mistake in confounding justification with reward; neither does he weigh St. Paul's words very accurately when he says that *μισθὸν λογίζεσθαι* and *δικαιοσύνην λογίζεσθαι* have the same force in his Epistles. St. Paul says that 'to him that worketh, the reward is not reckoned of grace but of debt: but to him that worketh not, but believeth, his faith is counted for righteousness.' Examine well and see if St. Paul any where says that reward is reckoned to him that believeth, and whether the passage of David can allow that reward is reckoned to him whose faith is counted for righteousness without works."

STRIC. III.

δικαιοῦν. μισθὸν λογίζεσθαι, δικαιοσύνην λογίζεσθαι, εἰς δικαιοσύνην λογίζεσθαι.

τὸν ἀσεβῆ.

Rom. 4. 5.

Rom. 4. 4, 5.

ver. 6.

ANSWER TO STRICTURE III.

What you mean in the first part of your remark, I do not exactly understand, nor does it much matter whether I understand it or not; for whatever it is that you there say, you express your agreement with and approval of what I have asserted, and therefore the only thing that I thought required consideration was your remark that follows, "that I have made a strange mistake in confounding justification with reward." Surely you are here yourself making a mistake. I am not confounding justification with 'reward,' but with 'the imputation or adjudgment of reward,' on the plain authority of St. Paul. But neither do you agree to this; more than ten times in other parts of your animadversions you complain of my not having sufficiently distinguished

STRIC. III. the reckoning of the reward, or the admission of a man to salvation and eternal life from justification. For, in page 10 of my first Dissertation, i. 6, where with almost all the reformed divines I thus describe the justification of a sinner according to the Gospel covenant, "It is the act of God as a judge, according to the merciful law of Christ, acquitting the accused, pronouncing him righteous, and admitting him to the reward of righteousness, that is, eternal life," you remark thus: "This is an uncalled for interpolation about reward, and an explanation of justification founded on no passage of Scripture. Eternal life follows upon righteousness, but in an acquittal from all the guilt of sin and the deserved punishment of death there is no place for reward," &c. In another place, page 8, because I affirm that 'to be justified,' and 'to be accepted with God into salvation' have the same force, you say that it is my leading error, "which I take for granted, without proving, and that the whole mass of my building supported by this weak pillar is tottering and ready to fall." In another place you say, "that I am often striking my foot against this stone;" and therefore it concerns me much to establish this doctrine on firm grounds, and to vindicate it once for all from your charges, which are scattered all over your animadversions. To do this more conveniently, I put the question to be deliberately discussed as follows, "Whether the notion of Gospel justification necessarily includes the reckoning of a reward, or the admission of a man to life and eternal salvation," or "whether conferring a right to the kingdom of heaven is properly the act of Gospel justification." I affirm that it is; you deny it, and you declare the line between justification and the reckoning of a reward to be so broad that "in the acquittal from all guilt of sin (which alone, according to you, is justification) there is no place for reward;" and you confidently state at page 30, that "the adjudgment of reward is quite a different thing from justification," and so in your remarks on page 12, you call it an act "extraneous to justification."

§ 2. To have a right understanding of the state of the question, we must first remark that we do not assert that the word justification implies of itself the reckoning of a reward. We are not such loggerheads or so stupid, as not to be well

aware that there may be justification where reward does not come in. In a human court, if a man is accused of theft, murder, or any other crime, and he be innocent, he is acquitted by the judge's sentence, i. e. he is justified; yet he has no reward for not being a thief or murderer. It is folly then that you ask me at page 25 of my book, "whether it is one and the same act of a judge, to acquit a man of a charge, and to be pleased with him, and count him worthy of reward." Who in his senses ever affirmed this? In this question, however, we are speaking (as you are aware) of justification as a term applied to the 'Divine court,' and the law or covenant of the Gospel. And that justification before God, which is required according to the law of the Gospel covenant, involves not only acquittal from sin, but also a reckoning of reward, there can be no doubt. 'To justify' means of itself 'to declare a man to be just' and 'to treat him as such.' Now whomsoever God pronounces just, and treats as such, to him God not only remits the debt of sin, but He also praises, loves him, and counts him worthy of reward, as Grotius has here rightly laid down. To sum up the whole in few words: The 'extent' (so to speak) of justification must be calculated by the law, according to the rule of which it is imparted. Hence, in a human court, a man is acquitted by the judge of a charge, in other words he is justified, but no reward is adjudged to him; because the law adjudges no such reward to innocence. But in God's court, when a man, guilty indeed of sin, yet possessed of faith perfected by love, is justified according to the Gospel covenant, not only are his sins remitted, but a right to a heavenly reward is adjudged him. Why? Because the law of the Gospel appoints such reward to the believer, and therefore, in this court, though it is not the same thing to acquit the prisoner of a charge, and to hold him worthy of reward, yet most certain it is that both acts come under one and the same benefit of Gospel justification, which is all we have asserted. After this statement of the question, the truth of my opinion is sufficiently evident, so that I scarcely need dwell on the discussion any longer. But, as this objection is nearly the stem and stern of your censure on my book, as you repeat it till one is almost sick, as you bring it forward

STRIC. III.

Discuss. p. 39.

δι' ἀγάπης ἐνεργουμένη.

STRIC. III. as an engine, by the force of which you boast that the whole of my building is falling to the ground; on these accounts I have determined to prove the point at greater length, both by testimonies of Scripture, and arguments and deductions drawn from Scripture; at the same time answering your objections, as they occur from time to time, in their several places.

§ 3. I will first bring forward the testimonies of Scripture which establish my doctrine. I will begin from the passage which I have already adduced in my Dissertations, viz. Rom. 4. 3, compared with verse 4, where I remarked that the Apostle, talking of justification, expresses *ἐλογίσθη εἰς δικαιοσύνην*, of the former verse, immediately after by the phrase, *μισθὸς λογίζεται*. Hence I infer, that 'to impute something to any one for righteousness,' and 'to impute a reward to any one for something,' are equivalent. To this you say, "that I err in my exposition of the Apostle, since he denies the imputation of reward, whilst he asserts the imputation of faith, verse 5." Also in the Stricture which we have before us, you say that St. Paul declares that "to him that worketh the reward is not reckoned of grace but of debt, but to him that believeth and worketh not, his faith is counted for righteousness." But you are making an egregious mistake. St. Paul does not absolutely deny, that reward is reckoned to the believer, but he says it is not reckoned to him of debt. To each of them, both to him that believeth and to him that worketh, he acknowledges that a reward is reckoned, but on different grounds: to the one of debt, to the other of grace. This is the plain meaning of St. Paul; he is plainly making a distinction between the reward of grace and the reward of debt. Now to what purpose would he make the distinction, if he meant, as you suppose, that there was no reckoning of reward but to him that worketh, i. e. of debt? Why then, you will say, does not the Apostle repeat in the antithesis that follows, what he denied, verse 4, concerning him that worketh, viz. that to him (i. e. that worketh), reward is reckoned of grace, and affirm expressly of him that believeth, "but to him that believeth a reward is reckoned of grace;" whereas he uses evidently another expression, "to him that believeth his faith

I. Diss. v. 3. p. 30.

is counted for righteousness." I answer, that by the very fact that the faith of the believer is reckoned to him for righteousness, it is quite evident that reward is reckoned to him not of debt but of grace, and consequently that his justification is merely one of grace, since 'faith' in its very term expresses grace, and entirely excludes all debt and desert. See the copious remarks we have made on this point II. Diss. xii. 22, 23, &c. p. 155, where, although the passage almost compels you, you do not utter one syllable to the point. But when the Apostle says that "to him that believeth his faith is counted for righteousness" he implies that 'a reward is reckoned to him that believeth.' For wherever in the Scriptures any thing or deed is said to be imputed to any one for righteousness, it is certain that by that phrase is signified God's approbation, or that He holds that deed to be praiseworthy, or such that He determines of His infinite goodness that it shall be recompensed. Thus, the vengeance which Phineas took on the idolaters in the ardour of his zeal for God is said 'to be counted (or imputed) to him for righteousness,' i. e. was esteemed by God praiseworthy, and worthy of recompense. This is clear from history, Num. 25. 12, where we read in plain terms, that God on account of Phineas' zeal adjudged him and his posterity great reward. See the learned Hammond on the passage in the Psalms. Hence however, by the way, we gather a new and very strong argument for the support of our opinion. It is certain that when it is said that 'a man is justified by faith,' or that 'faith is counted to a man for righteousness,' the two expressions are equivalent in Scripture. This I have proved by comparing many passages of Scripture together in opposition to Grotius. Yet here you would rather join with Grotius, whom else you hate worse than a dog or a viper, (and that against almost all the reformed divines,) than yield to the most evident truth, and therefore you say (and only say) that the two things differ really in meaning. Shew, then, their discrepancy from Scripture, and answer, if you can, all the passages I have pointed out and compared together. Meantime I pass on. It is equally certain that in the phrase by which any thing is said to be imputed to a man for righteousness, the adjudgment of a reward is the chief

STRIC. III.

Ps. 106. 31.

I. Diss. i. 5. p. 8.

STRIC. III.

thing implied. What follows from this, but that the justification, which is spoken of in the New Testament, comprises the reckoning of a reward or the admission of a man to salvation and life eternal; q. e. d. I now pass on to other passages.

§ 4. A most remarkable passage—one which you will not be able to evade by any artifice—occurs Rom. 5. 18. "Therefore as by the offence of one judgment came upon all men to condemnation; even so by the righteousness of one the free gift came upon all men unto justification of life." Here justification, which is imparted to the faithful through Christ, is not simply called 'justification,' or 'justification from death,' or the punishment of sin; but 'justification of life,' i. e. living or life-giving justification, as that which would not only deliver a man from death, but also bestow upon him heavenly life and eternal happiness. We must not forget especially that the Apostle, in the preceding verse, meant expressly to shew forth 'the abundance of grace and of the gift of righteousness,' or of the justification by Christ; to shew forsooth, that the gift of justification does not consist or subsist in the mere deliverance from death, which we have deserved by sin, but goes further and gives us *ut in vitâ regnemus*, 'to reign in life' by Christ Jesus. What can be spoken more clearly?

εἰς δικαίωσιν ζωῆς.

δικαίωσις.

δικαίωσις ἀπὸ θανάτου.

τὴν περισσείαν τῆς χάριτος καὶ τῆς δωρεᾶς τῆς δικαιοσύνης.

§ 5. A strong argument also for our doctrine may be drawn from those passages of Scripture where 'to be made heir,' viz. of a heavenly kingdom, and 'to be justified' are used as equivalent expressions, as in Rom. 4. 13, 14; Gal. 3. verse 18, compared with verse 21; Col. 3. 24. To these may be added all the texts in which 'justification,' 'life,' and 'salvation,' are used promiscuously. What other reason can be assigned for this promiscuous usage, but that in justification a right to salvation and eternal life is given us? One passage I must add, "But that no man is justified by the law in the sight of God, it is evident: for, the just shall live by faith." Where the Apostle proves that a man is justified not by the law, but by faith, on this testimony, that a man 'lives by faith.' The argument of the Apostle would entirely lose its connection, were not our supposition true, that 'to be justified,' and 'to have a right to life,' viz. eternal, were equivalent terms. So much from the testimony of Scripture.

Vid. Rom. 10. 5. Gal. 3. 8, 9, 21.

Gal. 3. 11.

§ 6. To these express testimonies from Scripture I will subjoin two arguments, which also have their grounds in Scripture, and are deducible from thence by manifest inference. STRIC. III.

1st. He who is justified by the Gospel Covenant, by that very fact has a right to all the benefits contained in that Covenant. Now among the benefits contained in the Gospel Covenant the chief and consummation of all the rest is salvation and eternal life; therefore he who is justified by the Gospel Covenant, by that very fact has a right to salvation and eternal life. Here the minor proposition is beyond question, the major is supported by these arguments. 1. If in the Gospel justification we have not a right to all the benefits contained in the Gospel covenant, then the Gospel justification is something imperfect, which Christians will at once shrink from admitting. 2ndly. Whoever is justified by the Gospel covenant, must, according to the position in which he has been placed, have performed all the conditions of the Gospel covenant. But he who has performed all the conditions of the Gospel covenant, must of necessity have a right to all the benefits contained in that covenant; since they depend on that condition. I say here, (which must be observed,) that every justified person has performed all the conditions of the Gospel covenant, according to 'the position in which he has been placed.' By which words I mean, whoever is endued with faith in Christ perfected by love, has at once performed all the conditions of the Gospel covenant which, in the position in which he has been placed, are required from him, although he yet may not have gone on in continued pious working; consequently he is justified by that covenant, and has a right to all the benefits of that covenant. But from that man, if time be granted him, there is demanded a continued pious working or a series of visible deeds, (which the Greek Fathers called *πολιτεία*,) as I have remarked elsewhere in my Dissertations, and therefore this condition of continued working is not absolutely demanded in the Gospel covenant, but on supposition, viz. of continued life. Lastly, St. Paul himself declares from David the blessedness, the perfect 'blessedness of the man to whom God imputeth righteousness,' i. e. whom God justifies. Of course a man, justified by God, would not

Rom. 4. 6, 7. *μακαρισμόν.*

STRIC. III.

be perfectly blessed if he were deprived of any benefit of the Gospel covenant, much less if he had no right to the chief blessing of the Gospel, viz. eternal life, in which the whole blessedness of man consists.

§ 7. The second argument, which confirms the first, is this; All men allow that if a justified person were to die in the very moment in which he was justified, he would be beyond all doubt saved, i. e. he would gain eternal life. Now it is plain to every one that this position would not hold good unless our own supposition be allowed also, viz. that in justification a man has the right conferred on him to salvation and eternal life.

§ 8. By all this I have shewn, I think clearly, that the justification of a sinner, which is promised in the Gospel, comprehends not only his deliverance from sins, but also the reckoning of a reward, or his being accepted to salvation and life eternal. I will add the following by way of make-weight:—If it were true according to your opinion, (as it is most utterly false,) that justification in the New Testament is distinct from acceptance to salvation, the cause I am pleading in my book would receive no injury, provided only that it be granted, which you willingly allow, that the two things are so mutually and inseparably connected that he who is justified always has a right also to salvation. This being granted, all the arguments by which I prove that faith, as a single virtue, is not sufficient for justification, stand good, on the ground that faith is not sufficient to make a man accepted with God unto salvation. To fix different conditions of things so intimately connected would be very absurd, and thus all this discussion of yours must fall necessarily into a useless dispute about words.

STRICTURE IV.

ON I. DISS. i. 8. p. 10.

ἐξ ἔργων δικαιοῦσθαι. causa sine qua non.

I say, when St. James declares that a man 'is justified by works,' that the particle 'by' expresses only "'the preceding condition,' which is generally called 'the indispensable cause,' yet it scarcely deserves the name of a cause." I then add,

"When a man is said 'to be justified by faith,' the particle 'by' is used in the same sense, since no one can be said to be justified by faith itself as a principal cause, nor even as a cause at all, unless inaccurately speaking." Your remark upon this is, "When we are said to be justified 'by faith' we clearly mean to say that the 'operation' of faith is the cause of the righteousness, which we obtain through Christ." STRIC. IV. ἐκ πίστεως δικαιοῦσθαι. ἐκ πίστεως, διὰ πίστεως. ἐνέργειαν.

ANSWER TO STRICTURE IV.

Had I written as much of any other of our virtues, how quickly would you have exclaimed, as is your wont, "My mind is horrified as I read this new doctrine." Here you attribute to faith, an operation which is the cause of righteousness, distinct from that which belongs to it as a condition of the Gospel covenant, for this latter I acknowledge; but, as I said, the condition is only 'the indispensable cause,' which scarcely deserves the name of a cause. You, however, take a higher tone, and ascribe to faith another operation beyond this, as really causing righteousness. Surely this doctrine of yours is new indeed! For what confession of the reformed Churches attributes to faith an operation which is the cause (in your sense) of righteousness? at least our Church is very far from agreeing with this doctrine, as I shewed clearly II. Diss. last chapter. Even those systematizers of yours, who have attributed some sort of instrumentality to faith in the work of justification, disagree with you here. They, indeed, teach that faith is the instrument of justification, but 'passively' only or 'receptively,' as they love to speak; yet they have not dared with you to ascribe to faith an operation (*ἐνέργειαν*) which is the cause of righteousness, and have even shewn a dislike to the expression. How consistently they have written on the subject, I am at no pains to say; I neither sow nor reap in such fields. Suffice it to say, that not even they approve of this your way of speaking. Of the 'instrumentality' of faith, which you assert, we will speak more at length in its proper place; meanwhile bear in mind, that you have attributed more to human agency in the work of justification, than I dare ascribe to it. ἐνέργεια. passivum. receptivum.

STRICTURE V.

ON I. DISS. ii. 5. p. 14. (p. 19.)

STRIC. V. Among other testimonies from Scripture, to prove St. James's hypothesis, I bring forward the words of St. Peter, the chief of the Apostles, "God is no respecter of persons, but in every nation he that feareth Him, and worketh righteousness, is accepted with Him:" which words I paraphrase thus; 'God respects the person of none; every one, and such only, are accepted by Him to salvation, who works righteousness.' I subjoin, "Can any thing be more evident?" Your remark upon these words is couched in these terms: "In truth, what St. Peter, to whom St. Paul is equal, has said, is quite clear, but nothing to the purpose. He who worketh righteousness is accepted with God. You add of your own, 'to salvation,' which St. Peter said not. Surely Cornelius, who was accepted with God on account of his righteousness, was not fully instructed unto salvation, until he believed in Christ. Neither the pious centurion, nor any other worker of righteousness, is in that sense righteous before God, and free from all blame on account of his inherent righteousness. Take heed you prate not against the Holy Spirit."

Acts 10. 34, 35.

ANSWER TO STRICTURE V.

§ 1. You seem to object to my calling St. Peter, by the way, the chief of the Apostles; although I said it on the authority of the most ancient and approved doctors in the Church. They however, as do I also, most fully allow, in opposition to the Roman Catholics, that St. Paul, or any other of the Apostles, as regards the office of an Apostle, or the government of the Church, was equal with St. Peter. Let it suffice, however, to have thus briefly touched upon this point. You say, that what St. Peter says is clear enough, but nothing to the purpose. I say, however, that it is very much to my purpose. For if no one is accepted with God unto salvation, except he who fears Him and works righteousness, it follows that no one, who is not such, is justified; since

'being accepted with God unto salvation' and 'being justified by God' are equivalent terms, which I have just shewn clearly and fully. But you say I have added 'to salvation' of my own; I confess it, but it is an addition recommended both by the text and the nature of the thing. Has any one any doubt, that the man who fears God and works righteousness, is also accepted by Him unto salvation? STRIC. V.

§ 2. Next you say that Cornelius (on occasion of whom St. Peter uttered those words) was not fully instructed unto salvation until he believed in Christ. This requires consideration. That this centurion was a proselyte of the Jewish religion, of that class who were called 'proselytes of the gate,' i. e. men who had forsaken idolatrous worship and given themselves up to the true God of the Israelites, but had not submitted to circumcision and all the other rites and ceremonies of the Mosaic law, (although I am aware that there are learned men now-a-days who call this in question,) there seems to me to be no doubt. For, besides that the centurion is called by St. Luke (*εὐσεβὴς καὶ φοβούμενος τὸν Θεόν*), "a devout man, and one that feared God," Acts 10. 2. and (*μαρτυρούμενος ὑπὸ ὅλου τοῦ ἔθνους τῶν Ἰουδαίων*), "of ver. 22. good report among all the nation of the Jews," which words clearly shew that he was decidedly imbued with the Jewish religion,—besides this, it deserves our especial attention that St. Peter, in his discourse to Cornelius and his household, proved Jesus to be the Messiah from the books of the ver. 43. Prophets, which he surely would not have done had not the writings of the Prophets been both well known and of authority with the centurion and those who were with him.

§ 3. Cornelius then was a proselyte to the Jewish religion, but of the lower order, i. e. 'a proselyte of the gate,' one not properly called proselyte, 'a proselyte of righteousness or the covenant,' inasmuch as he was not circumcised, as we learn Acts 11. 3. As to the salvation of proselytes of this order the Jews differed in opinion. Some denied them hope of salvation altogether, as appears from Acts 15. 1; most, however, inclined to the milder opinion, and gladly believed that these pious men from among the Gentiles will share the blessings of a future life. The strongest argument for this opinion was, that circumcision was not enjoined on any

גר שער

גר צדק or ברית

STRIC. V.

except the descendants of Abraham, nor the law of Moses except on the Israelites. Hence in the well-known story of Izates, king of the Adiabeni, which is told in Josephus, we read that Izates, having turned from the worship of idols to that of the One True God, was not content with this, but wished to go farther, and submit to circumcision, (*νομίζοντα μὴ ἂν εἶναι βεβαίως Ἰουδαῖον, εἰ μὴ περιτέμοιτο,*) 'thinking that he was not a Jew to any purpose till he was circumcised;' but this design pleased not his teacher Ananias, who reminded the king (*δυνάμενον αὐτὸν καὶ χωρὶς περιτομῆς τὸ Θεῖον σέβειν*) 'that he could serve God without being circumcised.' What however the Jews thought on this point, matters not much; all Christians have allowed that pious men of the Gentiles, who were really pious, pleased God unto salvation without circumcision; and that Cornelius was such a man, is clear from the testimony of the Holy Spirit, who has passed upon him, as I observed before, this elogium, that he was "a devout man and one that feared God." Moreover his prayers and his alms are said to have ascended up to Heaven (*εἰς μνημόσυνον ἐνώπιον τοῦ Θεοῦ*) "for a memorial before God." In these words, (as learned interpreters have observed,) a similitude is drawn from the incense of the law, called in Hebrew אזכרה, in Greek *μνημόσυνον*. Doubtless the words mean, that the prayers and alms of Cornelius were most pleasant and acceptable before God, which could not be said of the works of a man who was out of the pale of favour and salvation; and therefore had Cornelius died in this state, without doubt he would have attained life and salvation; and yet he had not an explicit faith in Christ, for he had not heard the Gospel of Christ fully and clearly explained. But afterwards, when this was done by St. Peter, his pious soul most eagerly and heartily embraced the faith of Jesus Christ.

Gen. 17. 10, 11, 12.

Antiq. 20. 2. § 5. vol. i. p. 959.

Acts 10. 4.

Lev. 2. et alibi.

§ 4. When after this you say that neither the pious centurion nor any other worker of righteousness was ever righteous in God's sight, and free from all blame, on account of his inherent righteousness, if you mean by the words "on account of his inherent righteousness," 'on account of the merit of his inherent righteousness,' you are beating the air; who says the contrary? I surely do not, who every where

disclaim all merit of all human righteousness, and tell all men openly that I trust in the sacrifice of Jesus Christ, my dearest Saviour, as the sole meritorious cause of my justification and salvation. If you do not believe a profession I have made so often, I call God the searcher of hearts to witness that it is from my heart I have written these words. In your remarks, however, you are continually charging me with teaching that man is justified in God's sight on account of his inherent righteousness, or on account of his works, (i. e. on account of the merit of his works). This you repeat till you are hoarse, when you have nothing else to say. Surely this does not become a Christian, not to say a divine. Had I a mind to repay you in your own coin, how easily could I retort this calumny on your head? with how great appearance of truth, how great speciousness could I do so? you teach continually that "a man is justified 'for' or 'on account of' his faith," that "an operation which is the cause of our righteousness ought to be attributed to faith," that "our justification is 'founded' on our faith." Should I hence conclude that you attribute a merit to faith in the work of justification? God forbid! I believe that you do mean something else, though what that is, I am totally ignorant. STRIC. V.

§ 5. Lastly, you advise me "take heed that I prate not against the Holy Spirit." But, my good Sir, what is it that you mean? that he who does not receive your statements, forthwith prates against the Holy Ghost? Take heed you offer not wrong to His Supreme Majesty, by appealing to Him as the Patron and even the Author of your own dreamings. I can do no more than beseech that Most Holy Spirit, the Comforter, the only Teacher of Truth, that He may be pleased by His heavenly illumination to guide both me and you into all truth necessary or useful to us.

STRICTURE VI.

ON I. DISS. ii. 5. p. 13.

Bringing forward by the way a passage of St. Peter, I remark that the order of man's salvation is well described therein. First comes "the sanctification of the Spirit to obedience," (*ἁγιασμὸς πνεύματος εἰς ὑπακοήν*:) then follows 1 Pet. 1. 2.

STRIC. VI. "the sprinkling of the blood of Jesus Christ, (ῥαντισμὸς αἵματος Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ,) i. e. to justification." Upon this you remark, "How absurdly do you interpret St. Peter, in order that he may support your own hypothesis! I beg to ask whether our sanctification, just as much as our justification, must not be referred to the sprinkling of the blood of Christ?"

Vid. Tit. 2. 14. Heb. 9. 14. Rev. 1. 5.

ANSWER TO STRICTURE VI.

How childishly do you here take my explanation to pieces, merely to indulge your insatiable appetite of finding fault. I am aware that our sanctification just as much as our justification is owing to the blood of Christ; Christ by His blood, i. e. by His death, obtained for us the grace not only of justification, but also of sanctification. Still, he who has not observed that our sanctification is attributed specially by the Scriptures to the Spirit of Christ, while the remission of our sins (which is not the least part of our justification) is attributed to His blood and the sprinkling thereof, surely cannot have read the Sacred Volumes with the care and diligence that they require. I have no time just now to investigate the reasons of this phraseology of Scripture, but if all, who suppose the words in this passage "by the sprinkling of the blood of Jesus Christ" to mean justification or remission of sins, are fools, then truly were those great interpreters Erasmus and Estius fools—nay (horrible to say!!) your own Calvin was a fool. Erasmus on the passage speaks thus; "He means that they are indebted to God for having been chosen to the grace of faith, which he here calls obedience, that through this, by the sprinkling of the blood of Jesus, they might be cleansed from their sins." In like manner Estius: "The remission of sins is called 'the sprinkling of the blood of Christ,' because no one is cleansed from his sins unless he be sprinkled with it, i. e. unless the merit of Christ's suffering be applied to him: and this sprinkling or application is made by the obedience of faith." Here you have (if I mistake not) the true meaning of the passage. Lastly, Calvin, "By the word 'obedience' he seems to mean newness of life, but by 'the sprinkling of the blood of Christ' remission of sins."

STRICTURE VII.

ON I. DISS. ii. 6. p. 14.

Here I bring forward testimonies of Scripture, "which specify some particular works as entirely necessary to salvation," and I insist on those passages especially, "which require 'repentance' as a precedent condition without which no sinner can obtain pardon from God." Among such a crowd of testimonies I confine myself to two, viz. Acts 2. 38, and 3. 19. I say, that in these passages, besides faith, repentance also and turning to God are required of us as necessary for the remission of our sins, or justification. Your answer to this is, "Christ has joined repentance with faith as the two conditions of the Gospel, and woe be to him who separates them. But produce a passage, if you can, which attributes justification to repentance. Justification is not the same thing as remission of sins. Wisdom is justified, God is justified, Christ was justified; where is no place for remission of sins. Job was justified from the calumny of the devil, and the unjust reproofs of his friends: and yet not by remission of sins, but by proof of his integrity. God pardoned the Israelites, whom He did not justify."

STRIC. VII.

sine quâ non.

Mark 1. 15.

Ps. 78. 38.

ANSWER TO STRICTURE VII.

§ 1. I have no doubt the learned reader, who is not acquainted with you and your ways of proceeding, will wonder what you mean in this Stricture. I am by this time too well acquainted with you. Now, on this point, nearly the whole strength of your position rests; and if you are victorious here, your triumph will be complete; but if these forces (as I expect will be the case) be routed and dispersed without difficulty, you can have but little hope of renewing the conflict. I intreat the reader, therefore, to weigh most attentively the arguments on both sides. That repentance is a condition necessarily required in the Gospel covenant, you allow, but you deny that it is a condition of justification. You do not deny that repentance is absolutely required for

STRIC. VII. the forgiveness of sins; but you deny that it is required for justification, for you say that remission of sins is a totally different thing from justification.

The whole of this controversy, then, may be reduced to four heads. 1. Whether there be any condition (properly so called) of the Gospel covenant which is not also a condition of Gospel justification? 2. Whether, granted that the condition of the Gospel covenant may be distinct from the condition of Gospel justification, it is not still certain that faith and repentance are conditions of one and the same benefit, viz. of Gospel justification? 3. Whether remission of sins comes into the notion or definition of Gospel justification? or whether the notion of Gospel justification necessarily includes remission of sins? 4. Whether it being granted that remission of sins is not necessarily included in the notion of Gospel justification, it is not still certain that the condition of both benefits, viz. Gospel forgiveness and justification, is exactly the same? Let us discuss these questions separately, and in the order proposed.

§ 2. The first question is, whether there be a condition (properly so called) in the Gospel covenant which is not also a condition of Gospel justification? You say that there is, in that you assert that repentance is a condition of the Mark 1.15. Gospel, joined by Christ with faith, yet impugn my saying that repentance is a condition of justification. Elsewhere, however, you explain yourself more fully, viz. in your notes to page 21 of my book, where I quote your own words. "I am often compelled to reiterate, that a condition of the covenant must be distinguished from the foundation of justification. There are many conditions of the Gospel covenant; there is one only foundation of justification on our part, which is, on the authority of St. Paul, faith." Here, by "the foundation of our justification on our part," if you speak properly, you mean the condition required on our part for justification; inasmuch as all 'right' is founded in the title, and the title is 'the foundation of our right.' This title or foundation of right, is called by divines in this question, the 'condition;' which is a word used by lawyers, and is thus defined by them: "A condition is the suspension of a disposition on an event as yet uncertain annexed to it." You

say then, that though there are many conditions of the Gospel covenant, there is but one condition of justification, i. e. faith. To this statement of yours I oppose the following assertion as anti-statement; "there is one and the same condition (properly so called) of the Gospel covenant and of Gospel justification."

§ 3. Here, however, some things must be premised, in order to define the state of the question. First, we must observe, that by the 'condition' of the Gospel is here meant, not whatever is enjoined in the Gospel, but that only which is required at the peril of the soul; i. e. the condition on which the eternal life and salvation of a man so depends, that if performed, a man will attain salvation, if not, he will have no hope of attaining it; and accordingly, that is properly by lawyers called a condition (as I remarked just now) on which the disposition depends. We are enjoined in the Gospel to abstain as far as possible from all sin; but this is not required of us at the peril of our souls, or under the irrevocable penalty of death, (as the schoolmen say,) for then very few indeed, or rather none would obtain salvation. Yet, that in this question such a condition must be understood is evident, since the question regards 'faith and repentance;' both of which, all allow, 'are required at the peril of our souls.' 2ndly. It is to be remarked that a thing can be required as necessary to salvation in two ways, 'absolutely,' or 'hypothetically.' Faith and repentance are required absolutely, with whatever appertains necessarily to their essence, i. e. all Christian virtues, in which consists the 'divine nature,' or heavenly truth, together with all which is comprehended under these two names in Scripture. Without these, no one ever has attained, no one ever will attain salvation. But worthy fruits of faith and repentance (all which are usually implied in the words, 'good life' or 'holy conversation') are required hypothetically, viz. if God grant life and opportunity. Thus much premised, I put forward two propositions (which contain as many arguments in my favour, and those of the strongest kind) to be proved.

ἡ θεῖα φύσις. 2 Pet. 1. 4.

§ 4. The first proposition is: Nothing is absolutely required in the Gospel covenant at the peril of the soul, which is not required for justification. That this proposition is one

STRIC. VII. of most undeniable truth, I prove by this argument: If any thing in the Gospel covenant were absolutely required at the peril of the soul which is not also required in the same covenant for justification, then it were possible for a man to perform all things requisite for justification, and be justified accordingly, who yet may not have performed all that is absolutely required in the Gospel covenant at the peril of his soul. Whence it would follow, that a man though justified, and even while justified, might be deprived of eternal salvation, and accordingly damned eternally. But what Christian does not utterly abhor such a conclusion? Surely the thing is clear and evident without need of further explanation.

§ 5. The second proposition is: Nothing is required hypothetically in the Gospel covenant at peril of our souls, which is not also so far required for justification. That course and conversation (πολίτεια) of good works, of which I have often spoken, is required at peril of the soul hypothetically, viz. if God grant life and opportunity: and on the same supposition it is required also for justification. He, who after having once obtained the grace of God in Christ by means of faith and repentance, does not thenceforth go on in a continued course of well-doing, but pollutes himself by sins destroying his conscience, that man falls from his right to salvation, and in consequence from his justification: unless indeed you affirm that a man while still abiding in a state of justification can fall from his right to salvation, which I have just now proved to be absurd, as is indeed self-evident. See our remarks II. Diss. xii. 29, p. 162. and our quotations from the most learned Davenant, II. Diss. xviii. 10, p. 214. The foundation, however, of these two propositions lies in this third: In a man's justification God gives him a right to salvation; which proposition I have proved at length in answer to Stricture III. Hence the conclusion is as clear as day-light, that nothing can be required in the Gospel either to gain or retain a right to the kingdom of heaven, which is not equally required either to gain or retain one's justification; and thus much then for the first question.

§ 6. The second question is; whether, granted that the condition of the Gospel covenant may be distinct from the

condition of Gospel justification, it is not still certain that faith and repentance are conditions of one and the same benefit, viz. of Gospel justification. I will here speak but briefly. You allow that faith is of necessity required to a man's justification; moreover you acknowledge that repentance is required of necessity in the Gospel covenant; but you say it is not required for justification. I prove, however, that repentance is of necessity required in the Gospel covenant, and that too to man's justification, by these arguments. First, repentance is enjoined in the law of the Gospel on a sinner, who is as yet a stranger to grace and salvation, as a duty to be performed by him in the first place; in order that he may propitiate God, whom he has angered and set against himself by his sins, or (in your words) that he may be reconciled to God. This is the constant and perpetual teaching of the Scriptures, a laborious proof of which would be superfluous among Christians, who are not quite strangers to God's word; and to the same effect you yourself expressly allow in your notes to page 8. of my book, that "repentance is requisite for reconciliation with God." Hence then I argue thus: Whatever is required for man's reconciliation with God, is required for man's justification: repentance is required for man's reconciliation with God: Therefore &c. The truth of the minor you yourself allow in terms; the major premiss is proved easily; if whatever is required for man's reconciliation with God, were not required for man's justification, then it were possible, that he who has done all things requisite for justification, and is really justified accordingly, may not however have done what is requisite for his reconciliation with God, consequently may not yet have been reconciled to God. But the conclusion is most false; therefore also the premiss. That a justified person, from the very fact of his being justified, is reconciled with God, no one in his senses will deny. Hence you absurdly enough deny that a man who is justified, from the very fact of his being justified, is accepted by God unto salvation—yet you allow that a man who is justified, from the very fact of his being justified, is acquitted of the guilt of all his sins, and pronounced righteous by God; and consequently no longer liable to the wrath of God due to his sins.

STRIC. VII. § 7. My other argument, somewhat akin to the former, is of this nature: Repentance is either required for man's justification, or not required at all. You allow that it is required. But, if it is required, it is required either from a man who is to be justified, or from a man who is already justified. That repentance is not required from a man already justified is shewn by our Lord's words, speaking of just men,—(ὅτι χρείαν οὐκ ἔχουσι μετανοίας)—"they need no repentance"—viz. that entire repentance, by which the whole kind of life is changed, and a man leaves a state of sin and death, for a state of grace and salvation: and of this repentance alone we are here speaking. Therefore this repentance is required from a man who is to be justified, and in order to his justification; it goes before justification, and disposes a man to receive the free grace of justification. "For Divine mercy," as Davenant says, "does not justify stocks, i. e. those who do nothing; nor yet horses and mules, i. e. those who kick against Him, and stick obstinately to their own lusts; but men, and those pricked in heart and contrite, and following the leading of the Word and Spirit of God." Certainly one cannot but look on it as a prodigy, that learned and sensible men should be blind in so plain a matter. I pass to the third question.

Luke 15.7.

§ 8. The third question is—Whether remission of sins comes into the notion or definition of Gospel justification? or whether the notion of Gospel justification includes remission of sins. I answer in the affirmative, you in the negative. Your opinion on this point you borrowed (as I learnt from the unfinished work which no long time back you published after your father's death, with little consideration for his good name) from your very learned father T. G., whose praises I should have had great pleasure in recounting, had you been silent thereupon. Nevertheless with your leave, changing the names, I will use your own words in the notes on page 7. of my book on Hammond, a man of the highest reputation, and at least equal to your father. "The most learned and pious T. G., whose memory I esteem and honour, was not infallible, and has often stumbled in this argument." I saw by chance a MS. in which two great divines are described as entering into a friendly con-

troversy on the subject of justification. Here was a system of justification, with your father's name attached to it, very ingenious, like its author, and drawn out with no small labour; but such as in matter of fact was not approved of by either of these divines. Certainly the ideas of the learned gentleman on this point, which you have undertaken to defend, are strange and novel, and opposed to the sentiments of nearly all the reformed divines. But to our purpose. In sifting this question, I will first endeavour to establish my own statement, and then refute your father's and your own opinion. I will accomplish my first task thus. First, I will explain the state of the question; then I will bring forward the arguments for my opinion: lastly, I will answer your father's and your own objections. STRIC. VII.

§ 9. First as regards the state of the question—1st, it must be remarked that we do not assert that remission of sins is the whole of justification, or that it fills up the whole length and breadth of the idea of Gospel justification. 'To justify' (as the word is used in the N. T. on this point) is more than 'to remit sins,' inasmuch as justification contains also the imputation of reward, as I have shewn at some length above, and therefore all that we maintain is, that remission of sins is included and comprehended in the notion of justification, or is one act of Gospel justification. You on the contrary assert plainly that "remission of sins is an act entirely extraneous to justification," in your notes at page 16 of my book. 2ndly, it must be observed that we do not assert that the word justification, of itself, implies the remission of sins; we are aware and allow that there may be cases of justification where there is no place for remission. In a human court, if an innocent man is brought to trial, he is acquitted according to the law by the declaration of a just judge, i. e. he is justified; but nothing is remitted to him, because he is not guilty of any crime; and therefore you toil in vain to prove that which no man in his senses has ever yet denied. You must remember, my good Sir, that this is a question touching Gospel justification, or the justification of a sinner by the law of the Gospel. Here we confidently and without any hesitation declare, that Gospel justification necessarily includes remission of sins, and accordingly that a

STRIC. VII.

sinner can be justified by the Gospel covenant in no other way than by the remission of sin. Grotius, as usual, comprises the whole in few words: "Justification," he says, "as is well known every where in Holy Scripture, more especially in St. Paul's Epistles, signifies acquittal, which (sin being presupposed) consists in the remission of sins, as St. Paul himself plainly declares, especially Rom. 4. 2, 6." I would that this great man had not afterwards turned from this most genuine notion of justification to another. 3rdly, it must be particularly remarked, that when we assert that remission of sins is included and comprehended in the notion of justification, we do not mean a *bare* and simple remission of sins, but a remission of such a kind as is granted on satisfaction having been made according to some covenant, or law, and on certain conditions. For we are talking (as I am obliged often to repeat) of Gospel justification, consequently of that remission of sins which is granted in accordance with the Gospel covenant ratified by Christ's blood, and under certain conditions prescribed and required in that same covenant. He who attends to these three things will easily perceive the truth of my statement, and will be able of himself, without other aids, to solve the objections which you and your father have brought against it. Nevertheless I will proceed in sifting the question according to the plan I proposed.

Lib. de Satisfact. Christi. cap. 1. p. 38.

§ 10. And so, in the second place, the arguments for my statement must be brought forward. Here, however, I will contend on the sole testimony of Scripture; for what Gospel justification is, may be gathered, by the best and surest reasoning, from those passages of the New Testament in which it is described and, as it were, professedly explained. I will begin with a well known passage, quoted in the Harmony; "Be it known unto you therefore, men and brethren, that through this man is preached unto you the forgiveness of sins: and by Him all that believe are justified from all things, from which ye could not be justified by the law of Moses." I said that Hammond had well determined that from this passage the true meaning of the word 'justify,' in St. Paul's Epistles, could be best inferred. You do not agree, however, with this opinion of Hammond, and you accordingly ask, "Why, I pray, ought the meaning of the word

Acts 13. 38, 39.

πᾶς ὁ πιστεύων δικαιοῦται. δικαιοῦν.

to be gathered from this text rather than from the long dis- STRIC. VII.
course of St. Paul himself, the very purpose of which is to elucidate the sum of the Gospel, as consisting chiefly in the righteousness which is by faith?" But in truth, whether from having been carried away with the too eager desire of impugning Hammond with or without reason, or of defending your own rashly preconceived opinion, you have failed to remark that you have rejected even your great Calvin's opinion, not to mention the lesser lights, the divines who followed Calvin. His words on the passage are as follows: "This passage shews plainly what the force of the word 'justify' is in other places." And this indeed is quite plain; for there is scarcely another passage in which the idea of Gospel justification is explained more fully. Your question is futile, since the idea of justification put forth in that passage is St. Paul's own, and excellently well agrees with his long argument of which you speak. Let us, however, (apart from authorities, either Hammond or Calvin,) examine the passage itself freely and fully. My words are: "whence it is extremely clear, that the justification which is preached in the Gospel of Christ, is nothing else than the gracious act of God, by which for Christ's sake He acquits those who truly believe, viz. those endowed with a perfected faith, and frees them from the guilt and punishment of all sins, even the greatest," &c.; and what, I ask, can be clearer than this? you will say perhaps, (what you do say afterwards, and nothing else have you to say,) that 'justification from sins' in this passage means acquittal not only from guilt and punishment, but from the harm also and fault of sin, and so is a very different thing from remission of sins. By this answer, (besides that you are defending a manifest absurdity, viz. that a man, who has been once involved in sin, can be freed from the very fault of sin; of which we will speak more at length presently,) you contradict in the most plain terms the text itself, in which 'the justifying,' ver. 39, is expressly explained by 'the forgiveness of sins,' ver. 38; for not only do interpreters (with the single exception of Grotius) agree, but it is clear of itself, that the same benefit of remission which the Apostle had briefly mentioned ver. 38, he explains more fully ver. 39, by shewing both its condition, viz. faith in

I. Diss. i. 4. p. 8.

δικαιωσις. ἄφεσις ἁμαρτιῶν.

STRIC. VII. Christ, and its superiority to that remission which the law of Moses granted: and this I have already remarked in the Harmony, p. 8.

§ 11. From this passage I pass to another equally clear:

Rom. 4. 6—8. "Even as David also describeth the blessedness of the man unto whom God imputeth righteousness without works, saying, Blessed are they whose iniquities are forgiven, and whose sins are covered. Blessed is the man to whom the Lord will not impute sin." By these words St. Paul proves 'that righteousness is imputed to a man,' or that a man is justified 'without works,' from the testimony of David asserting the blessedness of the man to whom God forgives sins. And what force is there in the Apostle's argument, unless you hold that a man's justification consists, at least partly, in the forgiveness of sins? If 'justification' and 'forgiveness of sins' are so separate from, and unconnected with, each other, as you maintain, surely the Apostle would have been arguing in this passage (as they say) round corners; and accordingly if I am convicted by you of unsound reasoning herein, I have my consolation:—I prefer being wrong with the blessed Apostle to thinking rightly with you. But see how much more widely still you differ from the greatest interpreters (among the reformers) in the exposition of this passage. Calvin writes thus on the passage: "By these words we learn that 'righteousness' with St. Paul is nothing else than the 'forgiveness of sins.'" Here Calvin's statement, that righteousness is nothing else than forgiveness of sins, must be explained from other passages of his writings, in which he confesses plainly, that besides forgiveness of sins, "the imputation of righteousness" also is contained in the notion of justification. Musculus writes thus on the passage: "The third argument is a declaration and confirmation of the second; justification is the forgiveness of sins; therefore we are not justified on account of our worthiness and desert."

dub. 5. Lastly Paræus, in explanation of the chapter: "That the Apostle places justification solely in the forgiveness of sins is evident from ver. 6; for 'to pronounce blessed,' 'to impute righteousness,' 'to forgive sins,' 'to cover iniquities,' 'not to impute sins,' are used by the Apostle as equivalent terms. If one is here offended by the word 'solely,' we may re-

member that it may be explained in the same way as Calvin's words above mentioned. STRIC. VII.

§ 12. A third passage, which is clear and plain, occurs Luke 18. 13, 14, where these two expressions are taken as equivalent, viz. 'to be merciful to a sinner,' (which is nothing else than 'to forgive a sinner his sins,') and 'to justify a sinner.' For when Christ mentioned the words of the publican praying God "Be merciful to me a sinner," He goes on to remind us what was the effect of that prayer; "I tell you, this man went down to his house justified," &c. Hear what Calvin says on this passage: "This passage," he says, "teaches plainly what it is 'to be justified' in the proper sense of the word, viz. to stand before God as though we were righteous. For the publican is not said to be justified because he had acquired any new quality, but because, his guilt having been cancelled, and his sins done away, he obtained favour." Whence it follows that 'righteousness consists in the remission of sins.'

§ 13. There is also a well known passage, Acts 26. 17, 18, where St. Paul is said to be sent by Christ to the Gentiles, "to open their eyes and to turn them from darkness to light, and from the power of Satan unto God, that they may receive forgiveness of sins, and inheritance among them which are sanctified by faith that is in Him." For who doubts but that 'to receive forgiveness of sins and an inheritance among the sanctified by faith in Christ' means the same as when it is elsewhere said, 'to be justified by faith in Christ?' Therefore he who is justified, by the very fact of his being justified, receives these two benefits from God through Christ, "forgiveness of sins," (ἄφεσιν ἁμαρτιῶν,) "and an inheritance among them that are sanctified," (κλῆρον ἐν τοῖς ἡγιασμένοις) i. e. 'a right to a heavenly inheritance with all other saints,' as I shewed above by many arguments. These two benefits fill up the whole nature and idea of Gospel justification, in the full extent of its signification.

§ 14. A fifth argument may be drawn from some parallel passages, viz. "In whom we have redemption through His blood, the forgiveness of sins, according to the riches of His grace." Eph. 1. 7. "In whom we have redemption through His blood, even the forgiveness of sins." Col. 1. 14. "For all have sinned," &c. Rom. 3. 23, 24.

STRIC. VII. "Being justified freely by His grace through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus." "Being justified by His blood, we shall be saved from wrath." What is said in the two last Rom. 5. 9. passages, 'the being justified through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus,' and 'the being justified by the blood of Christ,' is called in the former passages 'the having redemption through the blood of Christ.' But this St. Paul expressly explains in the same passages by 'the having forgiveness of sins' (ἔχειν ἄφεσιν παραπτωμάτων), or (ἁμαρτιῶν). For the words "forgiveness of sins" are put in apposition with the former in this way: "in whom we have redemption, i. e. forgiveness of sins." And in this all interpreters agree. Now from all the passages here collated it is clearer than the day, that 'to have redemption in Christ Jesus,' or 'to be justified by the redemption which is in Christ Jesus,' and 'to have forgiveness in Christ Jesus' are equivalent.

§ 15. Lastly, our opinion is confirmed by those passages where the whole of the Gospel is comprised under these two heads, viz. 'repentance and forgiveness of sins.' In Luke 24. 47, our Lord says that 'repentance and remission of sins' were to be preached in His name 'among all nations.' In Acts 5. 31, "Him, (Christ,) hath God exalted with His right hand to be a Prince and a Saviour, for to give repentance to Israel and forgiveness of sins." In these passages the announcement of the Gospel is made in two parts, 'a demand, and a promise.' Repentance is demanded, under which the whole of obedience is comprised; forgiveness of sins is promised, in which is contained justification, and the acceptance of a man to eternal salvation. Yet these would not be contained therein, if, as you think, forgiveness of sins were an act wholly extraneous to justification. But under the word 'repentance' obedience is comprised, because repentance is the chief part of that obedience: so in the word 'forgiveness' the whole of justification is implied, because forgiveness of sins is no small part of our justification. Hence it is that in the well known passage, Heb. 8. 12, all that is simply promised by God in the New Covenant, (it is true, our sanctification also is there promised, or the writing of God's law in our heart; but that is not simply promised, but is even exacted in some degree as a duty of ours, and has reference

to a condition required on our part,) is contained in these words: "I will be merciful to their unrighteousness, and their sins and their iniquities will I remember no more." To whom God grants forgiveness of sins, to him He even thereby grants all things. By all this, I think I have proved sufficiently that Gospel justification includes in its idea forgiveness of sins, which was what I had to prove. STRIC. VII.

§ 16. I will now, in the third place, answer the objections brought by you and your learned father on the opposite side. Here I will follow, step by step, the footmarks of your father, weighing thoroughly and accurately the arguments adduced in his posthumous writings against the common sentiments of the reformed divines. With your leave I will adopt this plan, especially as you have brought no objection that you have not borrowed from your father, and some things are adduced by him, which you have omitted.

§ 17. Objection I. The first argument of the learned man is drawn from the strict and most proper meaning of the word 'justification,' as it is received in the Old or New Testament. Never, he says, is the word there used in the sense of 'forgiveness of sins.' This he proves by a sort of induction of passages in which the word justification or its inflexions are found. In all these, he says, substitute in the place of 'to justify,' 'to forgive sins;' in the place of the word 'justification,' 'forgiveness of sins;' in the place of 'justified,' 'he whose sins are forgiven;' and see if the sense be quite suited to the passage where the word occurs; or rather, whether the meaning be not only discordant (with the sense of the passage), but also evidently absurd. He brings forward many passages of Scripture by way of examples. "Read," says he, "the words of Judah to Joseph: 'How shall we clear ourselves.' Read the words of Moses respecting the judges: 'They shall justify the righteous, and condemn the wicked.' Read David's words to God: 'That Thou mightest be justified when Thou speakest.' Job's words to his friends: 'God forbid that I should justify you.' Christ's of the sons of wisdom: 'Wisdom is justified of her children.' The Apostle's words concerning himself: 'For I know nothing by myself, yet am I not hereby justified;' or concerning our Saviour: 'Justified in the Spirit.' Read," he Gen. 44. 16. Deut. 25. 1. Ps. 51. 4. Job 27. 5. Mat. 11. 19. 1 Cor. 4. 4. 1 Tim. 3. 16.

STRIC. VII. says, "these passages in this way, (not to mention all the others,) and you will affix a sense to the words wholly unsuitable, nay, thoroughly repugnant to the meaning of those by whom the words were uttered." I answer—A specious objection enough; but one which is easily refuted by what we laid down in determining the state of the question. For, first, we have granted that the word justification does not necessarily or of itself mean forgiveness of sins; but we say that such is the use of the word, that when applied to the law and tribunal of the Gospel, it includes in its meaning forgiveness of sins; to wit, 'to justify' is 'to pronounce righteous.' Now, this is properly said of him who is truly just and free from fault. In this way no sinner can be justified. For it is impossible without a plain contradiction, that he who has once been entangled in sin should be pronounced by God truly righteous and free from fault, i. e. as though he had never committed sin. Therefore the word justification, transferred to the law and tribunal of the Gospel, and used of the acquittal of a sinner, cannot be taken in its original sense. He is justified in this court and by this law, of whom God declares that, on the most just grounds, his guilt having been cancelled and his sins done away, it has seemed good to His wisdom, justice, and goodness, to treat such an one as righteous. Secondly, no passage is brought forward by the learned gentleman, where mention is made of the general justification of a sinner according to the Gospel covenant, (the only matter in dispute,) to which his own rule cannot most fitly, and without altering the real meaning of the passage, be applied. And so his induction is lame and imperfect. In all the passages where mention is made of the general justification of a sinner, according to the Gospel covenant, if instead of the word 'justification' or its inflexions you substitute 'forgiveness of sins' or its inflexions, you will get a very good and consistent meaning. Thus all the places where man is said to be justified by faith, can be explained most suitably, and accordingly ought to be explained in this way; by faith a man's sins are forgiven, and a right to eternal life and salvation is granted him by the Gospel covenant: and that this is the full meaning of Gospel justification, I have already shewn

by many arguments. Nay, I have brought forward many passages of Scripture where Gospel justification is expressly explained by forgiveness of sins; all which it is unfair to set aside for any man's grammatical subtleties, be he never so learned. STRIC. VII.

§ 18. Objection II. It is evident that forgiveness of sins and justification are different things. For it is an unquestioned axiom, that things which differ in subject, differ from each other. And that forgiveness of sins and justification differ in subject is equally evident. For there may be justification where there is no place for forgiveness of sins, and, *vice versâ*, there may be forgiveness of sins where there can be no justification. The learned man proves both by examples taken from Scripture. If any one, he says, does me an injury, I can forgive him the fault, while yet in my judgment and thinking I do not justify him; *vice versâ*, he who is falsely accused of doing a wrong to another, may be justified; yet nothing is forgiven him, inasmuch as he is free from fault. 2 Sam. 19. 23. Col. 3. 13. 1 Kings 2. 8, 9. Deut. 25. 1, &c.

I answer, first, we allow at once, that many examples may be found which shew that there may be forgiveness where there is no place for justification, and *vice versâ*. But we must not forget that the question is solely in reference to Gospel forgiveness and justification; and surely these two do not differ in subject. God forgives no one his sins, according to the Gospel, whom He does not justify; and reciprocally, He justifies no one whose sins He does not forgive. The example, which the learned gentleman afterwards adduces, of the rebellious Israelites, whose sins God is said to have forgiven, while it is certain that they were not justified by God, I should not have expected from a man of his candour and good sense; it being evident that a full remission is not meant there, of which alone we are speaking; and accordingly he corrects himself, and allows in terms that, as regards the general state (to use his own expression) and condition of man, God forgives no man his sins whom He does not justify; so that this argument, even by his own decision, does not bear on the point. Secondly, since the controversy turns on Gospel forgiveness, it is plain that not a 'bare' and 'simple' forgiveness is meant, (such as is that when a man simply forgives Ps. 78. 37, 38. nudam et simplicem.

STRIC. VII. legitimam. another, who has injured him, his offence,) but a forgiveness, if I may so call it, 'legitimate' (or conditional), which is granted according to a certain law and on certain conditions; a bare forgiveness is not only not always, but never the same as justification. He whose sins are simply forgiven, can in no sense be said to be justified; since it is evident that justification is a term of law. On the other hand, a legitimate forgiveness, or that which is granted according to a certain law and on certain conditions, is rightly called justification, and is always the same as the justification of a person who is forgiven according to a law. A good example of this occurs in human matters: a king who has subjects in rebellion, and guilty of high treason, offers them pardon for what they have done, under certain conditions; for instance, that within a stated day they lay down their arms, surrender themselves to him, and bind themselves by an oath of fidelity for the future. Here the rebel subject, if he perform the condition, obtains the pardon of his crimes according to the law of the prince, or is acquitted of the charge of treason by the same law, i. e. he is justified. Such is the justification of a sinner by the law of grace promulgated in the Gospel.

See especially Acts 13. 38, 39.

§ 19. Objection III., and last. Forgiveness in itself, viewed in its bare and simple notion, is an act of pure grace and mercy; but justification, properly speaking, is an act of justice. Therefore, &c. . . .

Deut.25.1. Ps. 82. 3.

The first part of the antecedent the learned man fairly takes for granted; the latter part he proves by many arguments, and shews at length that justification is an act of justice, and not of pure grace and mercy, from the actual proper application of the word 'to justify,' which in every language, and in the common and constant use of men, is taken in the sense of justice.

I answer, first, I grant both parts of the antecedent, viz. that forgiveness, considered by itself, is an act of free mercy and grace, and, that justification, beyond all doubt, is an act of justice. What follows from this? This only legitimately; viz. that a man's justification does not consist in a bare and simple forgiveness; and I grant this: especially as I have already shewn, that where there is a bare and simple forgiveness, there is there no place for justification; and surely,

this has never been denied by the reformed divines, who have taught that a man's justification consists in the forgiveness of sins: so that the learned man is here fighting with his own shadow. The question is not, whether a man's justification in the Gospel covenant consists in a mere and bare forgiveness, (such a question would imply a contradiction,) but whether a man's justification in the Gospel covenant consists in that forgiveness which is granted by the same covenant? This question we constantly answer in the affirmative, nor does the learned gentleman, in the whole course of his long argument, bring forward any thing to the contrary. For, secondly, the state and condition of Gospel forgiveness are the same as of Gospel justification. As far as Gospel justification is an act of justice, so far Gospel forgiveness is an act of justice. Again: as far as Gospel justification is an act of grace and mercy, so far Gospel forgiveness is an act of grace and mercy. As to the former, that Gospel justification is an act of justice, this may be proved by two arguments: first, that it is founded in Christ's satisfaction; secondly, that it is transacted by law, and according to law. But who does not see that by the same arguments it is as evident that Gospel forgiveness is also an act of justice? For, is not Gospel forgiveness founded in Christ's satisfaction just as much as Gospel justification? Is not the Gospel forgiveness bestowed by law, and according to law? Assuredly it is; for it is therefore called Gospel forgiveness, because it is granted by the law of the Gospel; and under certain conditions prescribed by the same law. Hence God, in granting a penitent forgiveness of his sins, is called 'just' and 'faithful.' Again: that Gospel justification is also, and that peculiarly, an act of grace and mercy, (although the learned gentleman here speaks in a way that is by no means safe, and seems to separate every notion of grace and mercy from the idea of justification—of which I will speak more presently,) the Holy Scriptures bear plain testimony. We are said 'to be justified freely by His (i. e. God's) grace' (*δικαιοῦσθαι δωρεὰν τῇ αὐτοῦ χάριτι*). Where the Apostle uses a remarkable pleonasm to shew that the justification of a sinner must be attributed to the grace and mercy of God. Of the forgiveness of sins Holy Scripture speaks in like manner: "In whom (Christ)

STRIC. VII.

See Rom. 5. 9. compared with Mat. 26. 28. Eph. 1. 7. Col. 1. 14.

1 Joh. 1. 9.

Rom. 3. 24.

Compare Tit. 3. 7.

Eph. 1. 7.

STRIC. VII. we have redemption through His blood, the forgiveness of sins according to the riches of His grace" (*κατὰ τὸν πλοῦτον τῆς χάριτος αὐτοῦ*). Therefore, let the learned gentleman turn which way he will, he will find nothing that may not be as equally said of justification as of forgiveness.

§ 20. Thus, then, I have supported my own judgment on this question; it remains, that I refute your and your father's opinion. For although, on the statement of the common doctrine, your opinion falls to the ground of itself, yet I thought it might benefit the reader, were I briefly to explain it as it stands, and take it to pieces. Your opinion, then, (if I understand you rightly,) is something of this kind:—you hold, that a man is first made righteous by Christ's satisfaction, and freed, not only from the punishment of sin, but also the fault of it, i. e. from the 'desert' of punishment; that after this, all his sins are in consequence forgiven.

p. 6. Your words, in the sheets annexed to the end of my book, are these:—"God in the justification of a sinner acts faithfully as a just judge, when He acquits the faithful, whom

Rom.5.19. Christ has made righteous by His obedience, of all the guilt of his sins. Since the true forgiveness of sins inseparably accompanies justification, the Apostle proves from the Psalms that a man is justified by faith without works, because man's

Rom. 4. 6—8. sins are forgiven without works. For on this account God does not impute sin to a Christian, because He had imputed to Christ the sins of a world reconciled to Himself, and imputes the righteousness of Christ to the faithful, as the Apostle says plainly, 2 Cor. 5. 19, 21." Afterwards, in the same sheets, you say, "to justify is to acquit of the very desert of punishment, and make free from all blame;" and again, in the

p. 7. same sheets, you say: "He who is accounted righteous and innocent on account of Christ's propitiation and expiation of sin, must necessarily be forgiven all his sins, by the mere force of natural consequence."

§ 21. It were hard to say in how many and how great absurdities this opinion of yours is involved: let it suffice to mention three things only.

Firstly, This opinion necessarily determines the imputation of Christ's righteousness to be such as no reason can defend: nay it is diametrically opposed to Scripture and right reason.

All Catholics confess that it is by Christ's righteousness alone, or the obedience performed by Christ, that God is willing to forgive a repentant sinner his sins, and not imputing his guilt treat him as a righteous person, by giving him a right to salvation and life eternal. But not contented with this, you say that Christ's righteousness is so imputed to us, that by it we are accounted by God really righteous ourselves, innocent, and free not only from all punishment, but also from all fault. God's judgment is true according to truth, and therefore no man, who has once been entangled in sin, can be accounted by God really righteous, innocent, and free from sin. Of the imputation of Christ's righteousness we will speak (D. V.) more at length presently. STRIC. VII.

Secondly, This opinion labours under a manifest contradiction; it holds that a man who is already made righteous, and freed from all fault, is afterwards forgiven his sins and pardoned. Who can avoid hitting on so gross and palpable a contradiction? Surely where there is no fault, it is plain there can be no room for forgiveness. And so

§ 23. Thirdly, This opinion entirely takes away and overturns all forgiveness of sins in that economy of God by which He justifies a man. This argument is closely connected with the preceding. If you acknowledge any forgiveness of sins, you must hold that that forgiveness is granted either before justification, or in the act of justification, or after justification. But in accordance with your opinion you can agree to none of these three. Before justification no one, I suppose, in his senses will say that a man's sins are forgiven; that they are forgiven in the act of justification you openly deny; that they cannot be forgiven after justification I have already shewn; therefore according to your opinion all forgiveness of sins is entirely done away. But I have no need to speak here of inferences, for although you talk of forgiveness of sins constantly, it is evident you do not mean forgiveness in its true sense. Your words in the sheets added at the end of my book are plain: "He who is justified from a charge has nothing forgiven him. Forgiveness of sins has no agreement with justification." I say the truth, I shudder as I read this new and dangerous doctrine. You are here digging up the very foundations of Gospel doctrine, which every

p. 6.

STRIC. VII. where proclaims, and with the greatest praises exalts and extols that free gracious benefit of God, which is called (ἄφεσις ἁμαρτιῶν) 'forgiveness of sins.' Now may the impious heretics of Socinus' school quote the words of a divine who glories in the title of orthodoxy in proof of their detestable position, viz. "that Christ's satisfaction being granted, forgiveness of sins is not a free gracious act;" for you hold, that Christ's satisfaction being granted, the forgiveness of sins is not only not a free gracious act, but that there is no forgiveness. I perceive at last with what judgment the most learned of men said not long ago, "It is a true and Catholic doctrine that Christ made satisfaction for the sins of men; but it has been fearfully corrupted by Calvin's disciples; so much so that in this respect their error is more dangerous than that of Socinus." If any one wishes for an antidote to this poisonous doctrine, let him read Grotius' book, (approved by all learned and Catholic men, and deservedly taken for a shield against the blows and all the weapons of Socinus,) where that great man shews at length and clearly, that forgiveness is so far from being opposed to foregoing satisfaction, that on the contrary "the sole object of satisfaction (which is a payment of debt such as may be refused) being admitted is to make room for forgiveness." In the same chapter he proves against Socinus "the granting a free favour is not opposed at all to any sort of satisfaction; it is not opposed to that (satisfaction) which is both freely admitted, whereas it might have been rejected, and to which the benefited person contributes nothing: both which are the case with the satisfaction of Christ for us." And a little after, "A thing is rightly said to be pardoned as also to be forgiven, even when a payment is annexed, but such a payment as cannot but by an act of God's will procure our deliverance. For even princes, when they pardon criminals capital crimes, usually appoint them some fine as well as some public deprecation of their fault; and they are not said the less on that account to forgive the crimes. How much more justly then will this word be used, when the required satisfaction does not proceed from us, but we obtain deliverance gratuitous as respects ourselves, although not absolutely gratuitous? and Scripture marks this when it speaks of our

de Satisfactione Christi cap. 6. p. 118—124.

p. 128.

p. 129.

being justified freely, but adds directly, 'by the redemption which is in Christ Jesus.'" STRIC. VII. Rom.3.24.

§ 24. To these words I will add by way of seal the well-known testimony of Clement of Rome, an apostolic Father and all but inspired, in his Epistle to the Corinthians, which by all learned men is accounted genuine. c. 7. p. 152. *Ἀτενίζωμεν εἰς τὸ αἷμα τοῦ Χριστοῦ, καὶ ἴδωμεν ὡς ἔστι τίμιον τῷ Θεῷ αἷμα ἀυτοῦ, ὃ, τι διὰ τὴν ἡμετέραν σωτηρίαν ἐκχυθὲν παντὶ τῷ κόσμῳ μετανοίας χάριν ὑπήνεγκεν.* "Let us gaze stedfastly on the blood of Christ, and see how precious His blood is in God's sight, which, shed for our salvation, conferred the grace of repentance on the whole world." These words I have ever thought worthy of being engraved in letters of gold, and by all who wish to study true theology, committed to memory for ever; inasmuch as they contain the genuine explanation of the satisfaction of Christ as given by a companion of the Apostles. I have no time at present to shew, how the testimony of this apostolic Father puts an end in these few words to all question as to the satisfaction of Christ, in opposition both to Socinians and others, who in shunning the Charybdis of Socinus have struck upon a no less dangerous Scylla. The intelligent reader will be able to understand this of itself. I infer two things only, which bear especially on our point; 1. that the satisfaction of Christ delivers no one *ipso facto*, but only effects this, that any one may be delivered from the guilt of sin under the condition and law of repentance; 2. that notwithstanding the satisfaction of Christ, it must be accounted the free grace and mercy of God that He allows a sinner to repent, or (as Clement afterwards explains himself) grants us a place of repentance, i. e. that He is willing to bless the penitent believer with the forgiveness of his sins. He spoke of the free grace of repentance to express the free act of God in this work. But this is our very position, that the satisfaction of Christ being granted, the forgiveness of sins is a free gracious act.

And thus far then as to the third question, whether the idea of Gospel justification includes the forgiveness of sins? on the determining of which we have dwelt the longer, as well because the question in itself is one of great moment, as also

STRIC. VII. and most of all because every where in your remarks you are reproaching me with the false idea I have of Gospel justification, and state it as my great mistake, the fountain and source of various errors. But which of us has the truer idea of Gospel justification, the impartial reader may now decide.

§ 25. There remains the fourth and last question, viz. whether, it being granted that forgiveness of sins is not necessarily included in the idea of Gospel justification, it is not still certain that the condition of both benefits, viz. Gospel forgiveness and justification, is exactly the same? This question I will solve in one word. You allow yourself that forgiveness of sins proceeds from justification by the force of natural consequence, (as you call it). But whatever is required for that which is the necessary consequence of justification, must also be required for justification itself. I entreat you, do you seriously think that any thing is necessary for the forgiveness of sins, which is not also necessary for justification? You yourself remark (as we saw just now) that forgiveness of sins necessarily accompanies justification; and therefore that the Apostle St. Paul rightly proved that a man is justified by faith without works, because a man's sins are forgiven without works. Might I not then on the authority of the Apostle argue thus—A man's sins are not forgiven without repentance; therefore a man is not justified without repentance? for you yourself bring the reason of the consequence in these words; "Forgiveness of sins inseparably accompanies justification." Therefore, if I granted you that forgiveness of sins is not contained in the idea itself of Gospel justification, (which I have shewn to be utterly false,) it would neither help your cause at all, nor injure mine; so that you have plainly spent all your labour in vain.

Rom. 4. 6, &c.

STRICTURE VIII.

ON I. DISS. ii. 8. p. 16.

I here press those, who teach that faith is the sole instrument of justification, with a dilemma; in the elucidation of the first part of which I ask them, "How can the works of repentance be necessary to him who hath been already justified by faith alone?" You answer, "Shew one passage, if you

can, where the Holy Spirit determines works of repentance to be requisite for justification. I know that this is impossible; nay, the contrary can be shewn—meanwhile I am aware, and allow that God exacts works of repentance from us on divers other accounts; but a man may obtain the righteousness of faith, who is cut off by death from the opportunity of bringing forth fruits of repentance." STRIC. VIII.

ANSWER TO STRICTURE VIII.

I have in that place brought forward some plain enough passages, in which the Holy Spirit determines that works of repentance are of necessity required for the remission of sins, to which I might have easily added numberless others; and that remission of sins and justification are equivalent terms, I have just made most evident. When you say it is possible for a man to obtain the righteousness of faith, who is cut off by death from an opportunity of bringing forth fruits of repentance, what is this but egregious sophistry? The works of repentance are twofold; either internal, which are performed within, in a man's inmost heart; such as sorrowing for sin, hating sin, humbly submitting oneself to God, flying to God's mercy, loving God in Christ, and seeking Him before all things, the purposing a new life, and the like; or external, such as are completed in external act; of which kind are restitution, alms, &c. Only the works of repentance of the former kind are absolutely necessary to obtain the first justification, while the latter are necessary for its continuation when obtained, if God give man the opportunity of practising them. Yet these latter ought to be performed, in wish at least, by every man who is to be justified, which wish is to be comprehended under the purpose of a new life. All this I do not state in the passage to which you object, where I was talking of works of both kinds promiscuously, but had you a particle of candour you would acknowledge that I have stated this distinctly in other parts of my Dissertations. At the end of the second Dissertation (chap. xviii.,) I avowedly admonish the reader of what I would have thoroughly fixed in his mind, lest he should either misunderstand my Dissertations, or, in this

STRIC. VIII. § 8. p. 209.

most important point, should at the hazard of his salvation err from the truth; where read these words of mine: "It must be understood, that only the internal works of faith, repentance, hope, charity, &c., are absolutely necessary to the first justification; but the other external works, which appear in outward actions or in the actual exercise of the above-named virtues, are only the signs and fruits of internal piety, being subsequent to justification, and to be performed provided opportunity be given." But he who says it is possible for a man to obtain the righteousness of faith who is prevented by death from performing these internal works of repentance, flatly contradicts our Lord, who openly denounces eternal and inevitable destruction against all who do not repent.

See also II. Diss. ii. 8. p. 53.

Lu. 13. 3—5.

STRICTURE IX.

ON I. DISS. ii. 9. p. 17.

Here I say, "What they advance respecting the instrumentality of faith in the matter of justification is a trifling piece of sophistry," &c. On this you remark in the margin, "Without any vaunting, we think and say, with the Holy Spirit in Sacred Scripture, that a sinner throughmere mercy in Christ is justified by faith, of faith, and through faith, by God who looks upon the obedience which Christ has wrought for us, and that faith in the blood of Christ performs a special office towards our obtaining the righteousness of God; which Scripture, so far from assigning to good works expressly denies to them. Whether this influence (of faith) in obtaining righteousness according to God's appointment is to be called instrumentality, is a mere dispute of words. The question is, whether good works have the same rank, and equal honour and efficacy with faith, so that God justifies us through and on account of them, just as through and on account of faith. This I deny with the Apostle, who proves his statement; while you affirm without proving it."

ANSWER TO STRICTURE IX.

§ 1. They who assert the peculiar instrumentality of faith in the work of justification, do not speak with the Holy Spirit in the Sacred Scriptures. I call on you to shew a single

passage, if you can, where the Holy Spirit says that faith is 'the one' instrument of justification, which mode of speaking alone I here object to. But you say, Although the Holy Spirit does not exactly say this, yet He says as much, since He declares every where that a man is justified in, by, and through faith; while on the other hand, he no where assigns justification to works, but expressly denies it to them, and hence it is clear enough that faith has a special office in obtaining the righteousness of God; which is all that was meant by those who have said that faith is 'the one' instrument of justification. Here I fancied I saw an Achilles—but on coming closer I discovered it was only a ghost. The whole of your assumption, viz. that justification in Sacred Scripture is every where attributed to faith, no where to works, is false. On the contrary, I affirm that justification is not attributed to faith 'alone,' but to other virtues also; and oftener to other virtues than to faith.

§ 2. In order to make this plain, (and at the same time to put a stop for the future to this constant burden of yours,) I wish the reader to weigh with me very carefully the following observations. 1st. Let him remember that two things have been already proved; 1. that no inspired writer, but St. Paul, has taught in so many words, that a man is justified by faith without works; 2. that not even St. Paul himself has taught in so many words that a man is justified by faith without works, except in argument, and in a controversy, wherein he was engaged with Jews and other enemies of the Gospel. 2ndly. Let the studious reader observe, that among the other writers of the New Testament, the justification of a sinner is very rarely spoken of under the name or word 'justification;' but if I remember right, only in three places, Luke 18. 13, 14, Matt. 12. 37, and St. James, chap. 2, add to which Acts 13. 39, where he is professedly speaking against those who misunderstood St. Paul's doctrine. 3rdly. It must be remarked, that what St. Paul calls 'justification,' by other sacred writers is generally spoken of as 'forgiveness of sins.' This is clear enough from what has been said in the Answer to the Seventh Stricture (Sect. 8, 9, 10, &c.), and will be abundantly clear to any one who examines the Sacred Scriptures. 4thly. It must be remarked that wherever you find the justi-

STRIC. IX. fication of a sinner expressed by the very word 'justification' in the Scriptures, with the exception of St. Paul's Epistles, and that saying of St. Paul, Acts 13. 39, it is attributed not to faith, at any rate not to faith alone, but to other virtues also. Thus in Luke 18. 13, 14, it is attributed to the humble confession of a penitent and supplicating sinner: thus in Matt. 12. 37, it is attributed to men's words, viz. as marks of their internal piety and purity. By St. James it is constantly ascribed not to faith only, but to works proceeding from and conjoined with faith, and his (St. James's) testimony ought to be equivalent to all the rest, since he wrote his Epistle with the design of answering those who abused St. Paul's Epistles; of which I have often reminded you, so that I am surprised at your confident assertion that justification is no where in Scripture attributed to works. 5thly. Lastly, it must be especially remarked that in those passages of Scripture where man's justification is expressed by 'forgiveness of sins,' (which are almost without number both in the Old and in the New Testament,) it is almost always attributed to repentance, either directly or by some circumlocution, and that descriptive of repentance. Repentance and forgiveness of sins are a pair, as every one knows, constantly occurring together in the Scriptures. Nay in these two words is contained the whole of the Gospel, or what God in the Gospel either promises to us or demands from us, as is evident from Luke 3. 3; 24. 47, and Acts 5. 31. I cannot but pity your voluntary blindness, (to retort your own words on yourself,) who will not see things which are so plain. From these observations one naturally concludes that St. Paul had a peculiar reason as well for almost always calling man's absolution in his arguments by the term 'justification,' while the other sacred writers usually speak of the same under the expression 'forgiveness of sins;' as also preferring to use the word 'faith' to denote the condition of this same absolution, while other inspired writers have more fully expressed it by the term 'repentance.' As to the latter, why St. Paul usually expresses the one condition of the Gospel by the word 'faith,' I have already adduced satisfactory reasons in the Harmony, II. Diss. ch. v. To those add the following argument. St. Paul is opposing the enemies of the Gospel, the Jews

especially, who, clinging pertinaciously to the Mosaic law, refused their faith to the doctrine of the Gospel. On these, therefore, he every where inculcates faith as a first and necessary work to be performed, and accordingly if this were done every thing else that the Gospel requires, would, by God's grace, easily follow. Thus he says that 'righteousness will be imputed to those who believe on Him that raised up Jesus from the dead,' i. e. to those who believe in the doctrine of the Gospel, confirmed by the resurrection of Christ from the dead; not that this belief is sufficient of itself (for the very devils believe that the doctrine of Christ is true, and tremble), for obtaining righteousness, but because those with whom St. Paul argued, had need most especially of this faith, and, this faith granted, all the rest (as we said) by God's grace would follow. This reason is closely allied to the observation of Clement of Alexandria on the usual saying of our Saviour to the Jews whom He healed, *Thy faith hath saved thee:* "For those who were righteous under the law had need of faith; wherefore, when our Lord healed them He said, *Thy faith hath saved thee.* But those who were righteous in philosophy had need not only to believe in the Lord, but to depart also from idolatry. And immediately on the revelation of the truth they too repented of their former deeds." Afterwards in the same book, "So that when we hear, *Thy faith hath saved thee,* we do not receive that He said absolutely, that they should be saved who believed in any way, unless works also followed. To the Jews only He said thus, who were under the law and lived blamelessly therein, who were only deficient in faith in the Lord." As far as regards the first question, viz. why St. Paul in his discussions so constantly speaks of a sinner's absolution by the term 'justification,' this I think must be gathered from the scope of the Apostle. For since the opponents of St. Paul contended for some sort of justification more properly so called, (i. e. as I suppose, one which rested on the accurate observance of the letter of the Mosaic law, though more especially of the sacrifices and rites prescribed therein,) he was obliged to use the term 'justification' in argument, and accordingly to repeat the same several times on common ground with them, and what he took away from the righte-

STRIC. IX.

See Joh. 6. 29.

Rom. 4. 24.

Compare Acts 8. 37.

Strom. 6. p. 762.

p. 794.

See Mat. 19. 20. Phil. 3. 4—6.

STRIC. IX. ousness of the law, under the same name to attribute to faith; otherwise the word 'forgiveness,' (which all the other sacred writers prefer,) used for the acquittal of a sinner, would have shewn his purpose better, to express the grace and mercy of God in this matter.

§ 4. Your next observation, that the question "Whether the influence of faith in obtaining righteousness according to God's appointment ought to be called instrumentality," is a mere dispute about words I have no concern with. Let them see to it who have undertaken to defend this instrumentality, (who they are you well know,) and have thrust on others that mode of speaking by which man is said to be justified by faith alone as the one instrument of justification; for such men in the place, whereon you inflict this censure, I alone am opposing. But what do I hear? are you not yourself defending this dispute about words? are you not putting the authority of the Holy Spirit on this form of speaking? I could scarcely have believed you had so soon forgotten the words you wrote in the notes of the page just preceding in my book, in which you seriously warn me to beware "lest I make a mock of Holy Scripture, which says that faith is the one instrument which embraces the precious blood of Christ, the one ransom of the soul." Nay, but in the following page you again defend the same mode of speaking; your words are, "I indeed am so dull that I see no reason why faith should not be called the instrumental cause." What links shall bind me to such a changing Proteus? This inconsistency is a plain mark of a bad cause, of a man in great extremities, and quite at his wit's end. I beseech you to take a position somewhere, and stand firm, that I may know where to be able to find you. Is faith the one instrument, on our part, of justification? If you deny it, I obtain what I contended for in that part of my Dissertations; if you allow it, I again ask you, what sort of instrument you mean? a physical, i. e. a properly called instrumental cause? But the physical efficacy of faith, in the work of justification, I destroy by so plain an argument, (in the page of my Dissertations which your censure refers to,) that even you at length are ashamed of so senseless a fancy. Reflect on your own words: "We are not really such fools

as to say that the act of a creature has a physical efficacy in producing an act of God." Do you merely mean, then, that faith is the one condition prescribed in the Gospel covenant, which is usually called a moral instrument? You must either say this or nothing; for in this work, besides an instrument physical or moral, no other can be supposed; so you do at length take up your position here. Your words in the notes at p. 17 of my book are these: "We assert that faith, which is the gift of God, has by God's appointment a real efficacy in obtaining the righteousness of Christ, so that by the sentence of God we are counted righteous, and acquitted of all crime. This suffices for its instrumentality." These words find their fellows in the notes of p. 18: "In a moral matter the instrument which is required is one of the same kind as the matter." You say the same also in this very Stricture, when you explain the instrumentality of faith by "the influence in obtaining righteousness according to God's appointment." You say, then, that faith is the one moral instrument of justification, or the one condition, necessarily required for a man's justification, according to Divine institution and appointment, as set forth in the Gospel covenant. But that repentance, or the turning from sins to God, out of a true love of and affection for God, is also a condition, and a primary one, necessarily required for the absolution of a sinner, according to Divine appointment as set forth in the Gospel; this truth, if I have not yet either in my Dissertations, or in this Examination at least, clearly proved, truly for the future I shall utterly despair of being able to prove any thing.

STRIC. IX.

§ 5. We come at length, under your guidance, to the real and genuine position of the question. You close your censure thus: "The question is 'whether good works have the same rank and equal honour and efficacy with faith, so that God justifies us through and on account of them, just as through and on account of faith?' This I deny, with the Apostle, who proves his statement; while you affirm without proving it." I do not believe that any, or at least if any, very few of those whose cause you have taken on yourself to defend at such length, would stand by your explanation of the question. Usually they professedly deny that

STRIC. IX. the proposition "we are justified by or through faith" is to be understood as though God justified man on account of faith, or the worthiness of that virtue. In like manner we also altogether deny that man is justified on account of works, or the worthiness of works. It may, however, be said in a very true sense, that a man is justified on account of faith, or on account of works, if it be said in reference to the gracious covenant of the Gospel established by the blood of Christ, in which justification and salvation are freely promised both to faith and other good works. And thus any virtue of ours is rightly said to have honour and efficacy with God, if we regard the more considerate (if I may so speak) estimation and judgment of God according to the same most gracious covenant. Thus "a meek and quiet spirit" is said by St. Peter to be in "the sight of God of great price," (*ἐνώπιον τοῦ Θεοῦ πολυτελής*). I have no doubt that you mean this; but if your words may be thus explained, you have not given the true state of the question. For the question is not, whether faith or love is valued most highly by God, or which has the greatest influence in the matter of justification? (although that question may be easily solved, as we shall see presently,) but the question is, Whether faith alone is sufficient for a man's justification? or whether repentance also and a turning from sins to God, proceeding from the true love of God, is not required for a man's justification? He who attributes the principal part in this matter to the single virtue, faith, is without doubt grossly self-deceived by his judgment. Yet no sober-minded peace-loving man would think he need therefore take much pains to oppose him or pull the saw of controversy with him, provided he acknowledge the entire necessity of repentance to a man's justification. If he but agree on this point, he is at liberty to differ as to all other blessings in which there is no risk of his own, or others' salvation. One of our own divines has beautifully illustrated this by the following simile. "Suppose," says he, "a good many physicians, summoned to consult on restoring a sick man to health, should at length all agree that three medicines were indispensably necessary for the restoration of his health; this ought to be enough for the sick man, although the physicians totally differed as to the peculiar and specific

1 Pet. 3. 4.

efficacy of these medicines, and each man had his own opinion: even so exactly, when it is allowed that faith, hope, and charity are so absolutely necessary to a man's justification, and eternal salvation, that without any one of them he must altogether perish; but he who has these three, while he has them, is not in hazard of his eternal salvation: this is sufficient," &c. STRIC. IX.

§ 6. However, since you so wish it, let us discuss the question as you have put it, (very unwisely and without consideration for your friends). Certainly, whatever virtue of ours is of greatest price and honour with God, to it (if to any virtue of ours) our justification must be chiefly attributed; since we cannot have a surer mark or plainer sign of any virtue of ours being most valued by God, than this, that it has seemed good to His great Goodness to confer on that virtue the greatest benefit, viz. justification. Therefore you may bring the question at length to this, Which virtue is in greatest estimation and honour with God, faith, or love which produces all other good works? Hear the Apostle St. Paul on this: "Though I have all faith . . . . and have not charity, I am nothing;" and in the last verse of the same chapter, "and now abideth faith, hope, charity, these three, but the greatest of these is charity." Vain therefore is your remark at page 21 of my book: "We contend not for the superiority of faith, which we allow to be inferior to charity; we speak only of the use and efficacy of faith in order to justification." For, 1st, you contradict yourself; you just now said that no good work had equal honour and efficacy with God as faith: now you allow that faith is inferior to charity. Again, you said just now that the question is, Whether good works have equal honour and efficacy with faith, so that God justifies us on account of them, just as on account of faith. Now, on the contrary, you say that you are not arguing for the superiority of faith. 2ndly, It is very absurd, and carries with it the same contradiction, to deny faith to be the chiefest virtue, and yet allow it a peculiar use and efficacy in obtaining justification. Certainly that virtue is fairly accounted (as we said just now) to be the most excellent which has a peculiar use and efficacy in obtaining God's most excellent benefit, viz. justification. And what, 1Cor.13.2.

STRIC. IX. then, is the excellence which you concede to love, if you take away from it all use and efficacy in order to justification? Lastly, you flatly contradict the Apostle St. Paul. He teaches plainly enough that faith by itself and without love avails not with God; but you say, that faith of itself has all power with God, i. e. has a peculiar efficacy in obtaining that benefit of God, which comprises every thing else. See our observations in the examination of your Second Stricture. But I am now, and (I should think) the sober reader is tired of these subtilties.

STRICTURE X.

ON I. DISS. iii. 3. p. 21.

I had said that the 'royal law,' 'the law of Christ the king,' was no other than the moral law itself, according as Christ Himself set it forth, perfected it, and imposed it on His disciples to be necessarily observed as His law. To these words I subjoin the following. "This must be particularly observed, that we fall not into the same error as Luther, and most of our own divines after his time: who in disputing with the Roman Catholics concerning justification, and carried away in the heat of controversy, have introduced the following error into the Reformed Churches, greatly to their disadvantage. They taught that the Gospel consisted of promises only; that Christ gave to the world no law, but only explained the law already given; and freed it from the faulty comments of the Scribes and Pharisees; that the only use of the moral law at present, is to bring men to the faith of Christ, or at least, that there may be some determinate laws of conduct, recommended indeed to us by Christ, and which we are bound out of gratitude to obey; but not imposed upon us on pain of damnation, nor as a condition of the New Covenant necessarily to be observed to salvation. From these principles unguardedly laid down by them, and eagerly adopted by the generality of theologians, arose by strict and regular deduction, the execrable tenets of the Antinomians, Libertines, and Familists; which those good men by no means expected." You remark, "You are fastening a mere calumny on our divines: for where do Whittaker,

Perkins, Prideaux, Abbot, Davenant, White, &c., teach that the Gospel consists of mere absolute promises, that Christ our only lawgiver gave no law: where do they preach this medley of vain doctrine? Surely for an eminent man and one above the generality of theologians, you speak very unguardedly." STRIC. X.

ANSWER TO STRICTURE X.

§ 1. I have not here fastened a calumny on any one, nor have I spoken unguardedly, but advisedly; but you have totally misunderstood my words. By 'our divines' I by no means meant the divines of our own or the Anglican Church, but more generally the divines on our side, i. e. Protestants as distinguished from Roman Catholics, who were opposed, as I afterwards say explicitly, by our divines with an excessive zeal. And here I have not used bad Latin to express myself; for Cicero speaks of 'our' philosophers, (*nostrates philosophos,*) for philosophers of our school, and of 'our words,' (*nostratia verba,*) for words which are used by those of our profession. This is remarked by Laurentius Valla, Elegant. ii. 3, in these words; "*Nostras, Vestras,* and *Cujas* not only mean one's country and nation, but also party, and, as it were, school: as, *Vestrates philosophi non sunt ita populares et favorabiles ut nostrates, qui ab Epicuri schola prodierunt,* and *cujates philosophi vos estis? Stoicine? an Academici? an Peripatetici? an nostrates Epicurei?* Cicer. *Putaresne unquam accidere posse, ut mihi verba deessent, non solum illa vestratia oratoria, sed hæc etiam levia nostratia?*" Would, however, that it were but an idle tale that many of our reformed divines, who have written against Roman Catholics on the question of justification, have in their writings handed down to us that medley of absurd doctrines (as you call them, whereas you ought rather to have called them most pernicious). Alas! too many of their doctrines, still more fearful (if possible) than these, have long since been exposed to all the Christian world by our common adversaries the Roman Catholics, so that it would be to little purpose to cover the sore. Surely piety bids us, zeal for God's glory demands of us, to join the Roman Catholics in openly and freely con-

STRIC. X. demning such dogmas, as often as there is opportunity, although they spring of our own party: both that they (the Roman Catholics) may not seem to have good reason in laying a charge, as is their way, against the whole reformed religion, which is in reality an error only of individual teachers; and more especially that our candidates for the sacred ministry may not to their own great hazard and that of the flock hereafter to be entrusted to them, incautiously embrace so pestilent a divinity, which is concealed every where like a snake in the grass, in certain books, which obtain too much in our schools. I am not conscious of having stirred up this dunghill with any other motive.

§ 2. As far as regards the divines of the English Church, they would not be really such if they defended this medley of dogmas: since our seventh article, in the latter part, avowedly it would seem, condemns these doctrines. Besides, our divines always have been for the most part so well versed in the writings of the old and Catholic doctors (as being nursed in a Church which after the sacred Scriptures reveres most highly all that is left to us of the Fathers) that they could not but be disgusted at doctrines so uncatholic (if I may so speak). In other places too, foreign divines, who have handed down those dangerous doctrines in their writings, have generally erred grievously against the confessions of their own Churches, which on this point are almost all sound and orthodox.

§ 3. But listen! what if I shew plainly that you yourself in these notes have taught doctrines from which all this medley of vain doctrine may be deduced by necessary inference? Certainly this is no difficult task; let us see.—I am speaking throughout the whole of the chapter, of the moral law given by Christ, tempered by the grace of the Gospel, and accompanied by the aid of the Holy Spirit. Let the reader now hear what you commend to me, asterisked as most worthy to be observed and remarked concerning this law, in the Stricture just preceding. "Mark well," you say, "that the moral law is a law of works: but remember that boasting is not excluded by the law of works, but by the law of faith; and on this account we are justified by faith without works, that boasting may be excluded." It cannot

Rom. 3. 27, 28.

easily be said how full of absurdities this Stricture is: but I will mention only what bears on the point. If the moral law, as far as it is considered by us in this chapter, be in truth such a law of works as is meant by the Apostle in the passage you quoted, and from which boasting is not excluded, it follows necessarily that no Christian, no believer is under the obligation of the moral law, as far as we see; since no believer has any thing to do with the law of works, which affords a handle for boasting. But this conclusion embraces that whole medley of vain doctrine. STRIC. X.

Moreover, also, those dogmas follow from your doctrine of imputed righteousness as also from this, viz. that you expressly deny that the moral law is put before us by Christ as the rule of our justification, which we shall clearly prove in the examination of the Strictures immediately following.

STRICTURE XI.

ON THE SAME CHAPTER AND SECTION, p. 21.

I say, that "it must be ever observed, as an undeniable truth, that Christ, in His sermon, not only explained the moral law, but also laid it down as His own, and required its observance, assisted by the grace of the Gospel, from all Christians, as a condition of His covenant, indispensably necessary." Upon this (after other things which we have examined above) you remark: "No one denies that there is a twofold righteousness necessary for a Christian; the one of Christ, imputed to the faithful; the other performed by himself: the former is obtained by faith; the latter is exercised and shewn by works." See Mat. 5. Mat. 5. 16.

ANSWER TO STRICTURE XI.

§ 1. Every one sees that this Stricture, if you consider the passage it refers to, is wholly irrelevant. But as you are always putting forwards this distinction between two righteousnesses, as a Gorgon's head, against me, and generally use it to elude the force of almost all my arguments, I determined here, once for all, (especially as amid so confused a mass as that of your Strictures I could not find a more suitable place

STRIC. XI. for doing so), to speak more at length of this distinction, and to shew that you both hold an untrue imputed righteousness, and entirely take away all inherent righteousness.

§ 2. We must first treat of the righteousness of Christ imputed to us, and first of the phrase in which Christ's righteousness is said to be imputed to us. 1. It is certain that that phrase no where occurs in Scripture. 2. It is equally plain that in most, and those the most notable Confessions of the reformed Churches, it is altogether omitted. Of the imputation of Christ's righteousness you will not find a syllable either in our own Confession, or that of Augsburg, Strasburg, Wirtemburg, Bohemia, Flanders, &c. No one, therefore, who lives in one or other of these Churches, is bound by his subscription to embrace a phrase of this sort; but it is open to all such to enquire how far that phrase agrees or disagrees with Scripture and right reason. 3. It must be observed, that that phrase ill agrees with the well-known words of Scripture, in which 'faith' is said to be imputed to man for righteousness. Those words can be taken in no other sense than this, viz. that God in the Gospel counts our faith (viz. which is 'perfected by love,' as St. Paul explains himself) for our righteousness, and determines it to be rewarded. Therefore, not the righteousness of Christ, but our faith, is imputed to us for righteousness. Wherefore? for the worthiness of the thing itself? God forbid: but on account of the meritorious satisfaction of Jesus Christ alone, by which He obtained of God, that under this condition we might be made partakers of righteousness and salvation. Therefore, according to the Scriptures, the righteousness of Christ is not properly that (N. B.) which is imputed, but that on account of which our faith is imputed for righteousness. 4. Lastly, it must be especially remarked, (which a man of great learning has long since observed), that the phrase in which Christ's righteousness is said to be imputed to us, if it be taken rigidly, cannot agree with that which expresses the proper and genuine doctrine of the reformed Churches, in which righteousness is said to be imputed to us on account of the merit and obedience of Christ. For if we will have both to be true to the letter, we must say that 'the righteousness of Christ is imputed to us on account of

Rom. 4. 3, 5, 9, 22, 23, 24.

διὶ ἀγάπης ἐνεργουμένην.

the righteousness of Christ;' which expression bears with it a manifest want of exactness. But enough of the expression: we will now examine the thing itself.

§ 3. The Catholic doctrine is, that faith, repentance, hope, love, and all other virtues and good works of ours, by no means of themselves or by their own desert avail to any one's being justified, i. e. so that he is acquitted of his sins before committed, is held by God to be righteous, and is pleasing to and accepted by Him to salvation and life eternal; but that this is alone and entirely owing to the meritorious satisfaction of Jesus Christ, by which alone the gracious covenant (called the Gospel) was obtained and ratified, in accordance with which we are made partakers, under those most favourable conditions, of justification and salvation. So our Church, Article XI.; "We are accounted righteous before God only for the merit of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, and not for our own works and deservings," &c. So all the Confessions before mentioned. Nor is any thing else meant by the Confessions (which are very few) in which the phrase "the righteousness of Christ is imputed to us" is found in so many words. Hear the words of the Gallican Confession, Article XVIII. "We believe that all our righteousness consists in the forgiveness of sins, which is, as David bears witness, our only happiness. And therefore all other methods by which men think that they can be justified before God, we utterly reject: and throwing away all opinions of our virtues and deservings, we entirely rest in the obedience of Jesus Christ alone; which indeed is imputed to us as well that all our sins may be covered, as also that we may obtain favour before God:" where they say that the righteousness of Christ is so far imputed to us, that on its account we obtain forgiveness of our sins and are accepted by God unto salvation. And whosoever will avow that by the imputation of the righteousness of Christ he means this only, has my leave to use this way of speaking freely himself, as long as he does not thrust it on other people.

§ 4. But it is evident that by the expression in which you say that the righteousness of Christ is imputed to us, you mean something very different. You hold that the righteousness of Christ is imputed to us so that it 'really' becomes

STRIC. XI. ours, and we are accounted by God to have performed it in Christ; whence it follows that we may be said to be perfectly righteous by that righteousness, i. e. properly free not only from all punishment, but even from all fault of sin. That this is your genuine opinion I have sufficiently shewn from your own words quoted in the examination of Stricture VII. § 20, 23. Moreover in other places besides you speak to the same effect. Thus in a sufficiently lengthy Stricture, annexed to the end of my first Dissertation, you say that "God has conferred the obedience of Christ on the faithful, that being partakers of this, and being enriched with the riches of their Surety, they might be justified." In like manner in the notes at p. 164 of my book you write thus:—"The righteousness of Christ, which we obtain by His satisfaction conferred by God upon us and imputed to us, and accepted as though it were our fulfilment of the law, is communicated to us, so 2Cor.5.21. that we are 'the righteousness of God in Christ;' and therefore this righteousness is no less truly said to be in us than holiness itself is said to be in us. But there are different ways inest. of things being in us; quality is in us in one way, relation in another." A doctrine could not be stated perhaps more harmful or more dangerous. Truly you here lay the very foundations of the most pestilent heresy of Antinomianism: this is that source of error from which the extreme Libertines derive their fearful doctrines by a necessary consequence. Read the writings of those who in the late anarchy of our Church (never to be thought of without tears) openly defended Antinomianism: especially the sermons of Tobias Crispe, styled a D.D. to the disgrace of that sacred title. It shames me to tell my foreign readers how many deductions, loathsome to Christian ears, this Crispe draws from your assertion, and that with so plain an inference, that I confess I cannot refute his writings on your hypothesis; what you may be able to do, I know not. But leaving these monstrosities, it is not difficult to prove that the imputation of the righteousness of Christ which you maintain, plucks up by necessary consequence the very foundations of the Gospel, and overturns the whole of God's economy as revealed in the New Testament.

§ 5. First, this imputation cannot stand with the forgive-

ness of sins on God's part. This I have shewn fully (in the course of discussing another question) in the examination of Stricture VII. § 22, 23. Nevertheless, perhaps it will be worth while to recollect what we said there, and adapt it specially to the present question. If you acknowledge any forgiveness of sins, you must hold that that forgiveness is granted either before the imputation of the righteousness of Christ, or in the act of imputation, or after it: but neither of these can be held consistently with your opinion. That before the imputation of the righteousness of Christ the sins of man are forgiven, no one in his senses would affirm; since all orthodox teachers agree that sins are not forgiven except for the righteousness and meritorious satisfaction of Jesus Christ. That sins are not forgiven in the act of imputation, as you hold it, is also plain: since the imputation which you hold is wholly incompatible with the forgiveness of sins. This is clear as day, that to him who is endued with completely perfect and absolute righteousness, and is accounted accordingly faultless before God, nothing is forgiven by this act of God. Lastly, that a man's sins are forgiven after the imputation of the righteousness of Christ, cannot be affirmed without plain contradiction. For he who is accounted perfectly righteous and faultless by God, neither stands in need of forgiveness of sins, nor is he capable of being forgiven: since all forgiveness presupposes fault. Therefore the imputation of the righteousness of Christ which you maintain, takes away entirely the forgiveness of sins, (which is the chief part of the Gospel,) and so must accordingly of course be rejected by all pious men.

§ 6. Secondly, that imputation is wholly incompatible with the necessary requisition of repentance on our part. This follows from the former. The imputation of the righteousness of Christ which you hold, by the very fact of its taking away forgiveness, renders the command also of repentance wholly nugatory; since there is such a connection between repentance and forgiveness of sins, that if one is taken away the other is taken away also. Besides, what need has he of repentance of sins, who is already by God's sentence accounted righteous and wholly free from sin? What need has he of that imperfect righteousness, who by a faith of

STRIC. XI.

some sort, and before all true repentance, has already obtained the righteousness of the law, i. e. the most perfect and absolute 'righteousness?' Hence, that prodigy of divines, Dr. Crispe, whom I mentioned just now, has not blushed, has not feared openly and avowedly to assert, (consistently enough with his own, would that I could say not with your principles,) that no repentance is required from a man to obtain forgiveness of his sins; (monstrous to think of, and fraught with what wrong to the satisfaction of Christ!) that the repentance commended in the Gospel is nothing else than a sort of generous and spontaneous grief, by which a man who is elect is greatly grieved that he has offended a God so infinitely good, Who has now fixed all his sins upon Christ; nay, that a man may not, in the petition of the Lord's prayer "Forgive us our trespasses," have this meaning, that he may obtain forgiveness of sins; (for that this would not be praying by faith, nay, that such prayer would be abomination to God;) but have only in his mind the sense and knowledge of his acquittal now sealed and obtained through Christ's death. Of all these paradoxes, (at the hearing of which the most holy doctors of the ancient Church, were they in the flesh again, would be horror-stricken, and exclaim, as of old one of them, "O God! to what times hast Thou reserved us that we should endure this?") of all these, I say, you lay the foundation, in asserting that Christ, in the person of the elect, has satisfied God's justice; that as our Sponsor, He has paid all our debts; in a word, that the righteousness of Christ is 'really' ours, and before any repentance of ours. If you allege that I have undeservedly and invidiously loaded your opinion with these dreadful consequences, I ask of you but one thing, intelligibly explain to me how repentance according to your supposition is really necessary to the obtaining forgiveness of sins: if you do this, I will confess myself guilty; I will throw myself at your feet, and earnestly ask pardon of you.

§ 7. Thirdly, that imputation entirely takes away all necessity even of faith to obtain justification; and that being granted, it follows necessarily that a man's justification is prior to his faith, which assertion is the very dregs of Antinomianism. I know you will be disgusted at the inference,

but I also know that you cannot escape it if you will be consistent. The state of the case is this: It is absurd to hold that the righteousness of Christ is made really ours by faith; for if it is really ours, it must be ours before we believe; faith can have nothing to do with this. They who teach that the righteousness of Christ is really ours, must hold with the Antinomians, that we ourselves, in the judgment and estimation of God, have performed most perfect righteousness in Christ, and have no less truly satisfied Divine Justice, than if we had done it in our own persons; nor can that righteousness in any other way become really ours. Hence it necessarily follows, that assuming the satisfaction of Christ, all those to whom that satisfaction appertains, *ipso facto*, (before any faith of theirs,) are freed from the guilt of sins and made righteous. I therefore ask of you, whether the righteousness of Christ is our own on this account, viz. that in the judgment and estimation of God, we ourselves have performed that righteousness in Christ? If you affirm this, then it follows that the righteousness of Christ was really ours before we believed, viz. immediately after the sacrifice of Christ was consummated; if you decide otherwise, then it is plain that the righteousness of Christ cannot afterward really become ours. The fruit and effect of the saving righteousness and satisfaction of Christ can indeed depend on our faith, (and so *does* really depend,) so that we do not attain it before we embrace Christ with a true and living faith: but that the very righteousness of Christ can be made really ours by faith, which was not ours before we believed, is impossible. This was clearly enough seen by the more learned of the foreign divines who taught that imputation of the righteousness of Christ which you defend, and therefore, that they might be consistent, they openly and distinctly asserted that the imputation of the righteousness of Christ was altogether previous to our faith. Thus Piscator, "Men are really reconciled to God before they believe." So Bernhard, "This forgiveness of sins or justification in the mind of God precedes our faith, (which is our union with Christ). Wherefore we say that the faithful elect believe without doubt, that the satisfaction of Christ has been imputed to them by God the Father for the forgiveness of sins;

STRIC. XI.

in Resp. ad duplicat. Part iii. 7. p. 102, 103. Textor. Disput. de Justif. Thes. v. 55. p. 130.

STRIC. XI.

i. e. that God the Father had forgiven them all their sins before they believed." Lastly, thus Smoutius in his "Pater noster," which he dedicated to his national synod; "We defend the doctrine of eternal election and forgiveness of sins against those who contradict it, and who hold that our sins are then at length forgiven and covered, when we are believers and in our due time are justified by faith; and that the more, because our sins must be covered and forgiven before we can believe." He also says, "Forgiveness and non-imputation of sins precede and effect the knowledge of God, faith, conversion, regeneration, and renewal of heart, while we are yet of the world, lie in our sins, and profane the holy name of God." Is not this doctrine mightily evangelical? The same, however, not long ago, was (shame to write it) edited and defended by John Maccovius, professor of divinity in the University of Franeker; and a few years before a learned man in Flanders seriously complained that this most pestilent doctrine had spread much in the reformed Churches of those parts.

p. 5.

In Scripturali assertione, p. 46.

§ 8. Fourthly and lastly, that imputation wholly overturns the Catholic doctrine of universal propitiation made by Christ's death for the sins of the whole world. For if Christ performed satisfaction in the person of those for whom He died, and they are therefore accounted really righteous and free from sin by God, it follows necessarily that that satisfaction never had reference to the reprobate, as they are called: and so you will observe that they who defend this imputation of the satisfaction of Christ, all consistently deny that that satisfaction was made and offered for the whole human race. But the restriction and limitation of the satisfaction of Jesus Christ to certain particular persons, not only opposes innumerable testimonies of Holy Scripture, and those of the plainest import, (for for no article of our faith can clearer passages be alleged than those which are adduced for the universal propitiation of our Saviour,) but also the unanimous consent of the old Catholic doctors, as well as, lastly, the constant and every where self-consistent doctrine of our Church. What need of words? If Christ died not for all, vain is the preaching of the Gospel, vain also is faith, which is enjoined in the Gospel on all to whom that Gospel is

announced. The office of preaching the Gospel was committed by Christ to the Apostles in these words, "Go ye and preach the Gospel to every creature;" and such is the force, and such the extent of their command, that if one preacher could go over the whole world, and meet all and each mortal, he might offer Christ to each, and under the condition of faith announce and promise salvation to be obtained through Christ. For the serious calling of a man to believe presupposes an object prepared whereon he may believe. For if he for whom Christ died not were called to the faith in Christ, faith would be demanded for a false object, nay, no object at all as far as regards the man called. It would be just the same as if a preacher of the Gospel should call some devil clothed in a human form and mingling among men to faith in Christ, and promise him, if he believed, eternal life. Such a calling would be an error on the part of the caller, and empty on the part of the called, because he is called to believe in Christ, to whom Christ's merits are not by God's appointment applicable: and salvation is conditionally promised to one, to whom, even supposing that he believed, yet salvation is denied from want of a sacrifice and covenant pertaining to him. Moreover if Christ died not for all, then all would not be bound, as soon as the doctrine of the Gospel was made known to them concerning Christ our Redeemer undergoing death for the sins of men, on that account, to gratitude and the service of Christ. For we cannot with any reason say that they are bound to be grateful or perform services on account of the death of Christ, who are in every way utterly shut out from that benefit. Nor to any persons after the mystery of the death of Christ has been made known to them, can that text be truly applied, "Ye are bought with a price: therefore glorify God in your body and in your spirit:" nor "He died for all, that they who live should not henceforth live unto themselves, but unto Him who died for them, and rose again." For unless it be meant that Christ died for all, the foundation on which the ministers of the Gospel build exhortations of this kind will always be uncertain and very often false. Always uncertain, because men cannot know who are the elect: very often false, as often forsooth as it is applied to

STRIC. XI.

1Cor.6.20.

2Cor.5.15.

STRIC. XI. those who are not elect, who upon this title of redemption would not be bound to live to Christ, unless it be presupposed that Christ has truly redeemed them. Lastly, Christ Himself could not by right of His death (which the Apostle Rom.14.9. expressly says He can) assert supreme dominion over all and each, if He did not really die for all and each. Here I have almost used the words of one of our most learned writers; would that he had been able to make the rest of his scheme to agree with these words! And so the sum of all is—take away the universal propitiation which was made by Christ's death, and you at once put an end to all preaching of the Gospel; the universal obligation of men to whom the Gospel is made known, to believe in Christ, and to perform grateful service to Him, as their Redeemer, is taken away; lastly, the universal dominion and empire of Christ over all men by right of redemption is taken away, i. e. the very foundations of the whole Gospel are torn up. Whence the opinion of those who deny that the propitiation of Christ has reference to all men was deservedly condemned of old, as plainly heretical, in the Predestinarians, as they are called, by the Council of Arles: "Anathema to him who shall say that Christ died not for all, and would not all men to be saved." And this anathema of the Council of Arles was reiterated by the Synod of Lyons which was held soon after. Again I say that the universal satisfaction of Christ is not consistent with the imputation which you defend: since by such satisfaction we obtain only a right (which is common to all) to forgiveness of sins and eternal life, under a certain condition: and if this condition be performed by any one of us by God's grace, not the satisfaction itself, but the right acquired by that satisfaction is really ours. This is well expressed by a very learned man in these words: "By the death and actions of Christ a right was obtained for all who are willing to use it. He who wishes, by Christ's preventing and accompanying aid, makes that right his own, &c. They who say that satisfaction is imputed, go beyond the words of Scripture; speak obscurely and improperly; and involve the subject in difficulty rather than explain it. What then is the fact? we appropriate to ourselves what was obtained for all; we drink from a fountain that streams forth to all; we fulfil

the condition on which a royal indulgence is offered;" or to use the words a second time of the apostolic Clement, "The blood of Christ shed for our salvation was so precious to God, that on that account He granted the grace of repentance to the whole world," i. e. Christ, by His obedience even unto death, obtained from God that every man on the condition of repentance should obtain pardon of sins, and so life and eternal salvation; and on the performance of that condition, not the obedience itself of Christ, but forgiveness and salvation obtained and acquired through Christ's obedience, is given us by God. Here all is easy and plain because true. STRIC. XI. [5. p. 74.]

§ 9. From all these considerations, you yourself will, I hope, see under how many and how great absurdities your doctrine concerning the imputation of the righteousness of Christ labours. Nevertheless, that all scruple (if that be possible) may be removed from your mind, in the next place I will answer at some length the chief texts of Scripture which you or others have adduced in behalf of this imputation of Christ's righteousness. The first passage is, "For as by one man's disobedience many were made sinners, so by the obedience of one shall many be made righteous." Rom. 5. 19. I answer: Of the imputation of the righteousness of Christ not one syllable is here said, much less of the imputation that you defend. All that is here said is, that we are made righteous by the obedience of One, viz. Christ, i. e. we are justified on account of the merit of Christ's obedience; and he who shall deny this let him be for me anathema. You will reply, perhaps, that we are here said to be made righteous through the obedience of Christ, just as we are made sinners by Adam's disobedience, but by Adam's disobedience we are made sinners in reality, therefore &c. I answer, 1st,—The greater part of the most learned interpreters say that there is a metonymy in the first part of this verse. *Ἁμαρτωλοὶ κατεστάθησαν*, i. e. (they say) were treated just as if they had sinned in act, viz. because they were condemned to death; so the word 'sinner' is used 1 Kings 1. 21. So also in the same sense we find the word 'sin' attributed to Christ, 2 Cor. 5. 21, as we shall see presently. Admitting this interpretation, it is clear that there is no force in this argument.

STRIC. XI. But 2ndly, it were vain to press strictly the comparisons and antitheses of Holy Scripture in every point, as I could shew easily by hundreds of examples. It is sufficient, if on the whole, the comparison or opposition be fit and suitable, as in this case; As by the disobedience of Adam we are bound over to death, so by the obedience of Christ we are freed from death and restored to the hope of immortal life. But if you will have the Apostle's comparison made out exactly, see what answer can be made to the argument of Bellarmine on this passage—"We hold," says he, "that to be justified by Christ, is not to be held or pronounced righteous, but truly to become and be made righteous, through the attainment of inherent righteousness, and that a righteousness not imperfect, but absolute and perfect. For that 'to justify' is in this passage 'to make righteous' not 'to pronounce righteous' is clear, as well from the words "many shall be made righteous" where the Apostle himself declares what 'the being justified' is, and says that it is 'to be made righteous;' for 'to be made righteous' and 'to become righteous' are the same; as also from Adam being put in antithesis to Christ. For the Apostle writes that we are in such wise made righteous by the obedience of Christ, as we have been made unrighteous by the disobedience of Adam; for it is evident that by the disobedience of Adam we have been made unrighteous by an unrighteousness truly and really inherent in us, not by the unrighteousness of Adam imputed to us." Again, how will you answer the Huberians, who, from this comparison between the disobedience of Adam and the obedience of Christ, infer that all men together by the obedience of Christ are actually placed in state of salvation; just as all men by the disobedience of Adam are really and actually placed in a state of death? How will you refute Antinomians, who from the same comparison gather that all to whom the obedience of Christ relates, i. e. the elect, by the same obedience are immediately, absolutely, without any act of their own, either of faith, or repentance, made righteous: just as all who are involved in the disobedience of Adam, are consigned to death absolutely and without any reference to their own peculiar sins? Lastly, if that comparison is to be pared to the quick, what end will there be of this sort of

De Justif. ii. 3. [vol. iv. p. 1033.]

subtilties? The truth is, in this passage neither the way nor the manner, whereby we are justified by Christ's obedience, is by any means distinctly explained, (as nothing is here said of the condition of justification required on our part); but from numberless other passages it is clear enough, that the way in which a man is justified by the obedience of Christ, is this, viz. that if he embrace Christ by a living faith, he receives remission of sins and a right to eternal life by His blood. See what we have said in the examination of the Seventh Stricture, § 10, 11, 12, &c. The same thing is also plainly inferred from the ninth verse of this chapter compared with verses 16, 20, 21. 3rdly, and lastly, that the Apostle in this chapter never thought of that imputation of the righteousness of Christ which you defend, is most clear from hence, that he speaks of the communication of the righteousness of Christ as that which is universal, and extended to all mankind, upon whom condemnation and death had come through the first Adam. The Apostle's words immediately preceding the controverted passage are plain, ver. 18: "Therefore as by the offence of one, judgment came upon all men to condemnation; even so by the righteousness of one, the free gift came upon all men unto justification of life." Whence it is clear that the Apostle in this passage meant nothing else than that an universal covenant had been obtained and ratified by the obedience and death of Christ the second Adam, in accordance with which, and under the conditions therein prescribed, all the sons of the first Adam might be freed from death and condemnation. STRIC. XI.

§ 10. Your second and principal passage is, "He hath made Him to be sin who knew no sin, that we might be made the righteousness of God in Him." I answer: Neither here is it said that the righteousness of Christ is imputed to us, much less so imputed as to be really ours. If you think that what is implied by that phrase is here taught, you are much mistaken. That this may be made evident, the passage must briefly be explained. 1st, it is certain (which is observed by nearly all the most learned interpreters) that in both parts of this antithesis the abstract is put for the concrete, as is the way of the Jews, 'sin' for 'sinner,' 'righteousness' for 'righteous.' 2ndly, it is equally 2Cor.5.21.

STRIC. XI.

certain, that in the former portion of the sentence, the particle 'as,' or some word like it, must be understood; 'He made Him to be a sinner,' i. e. as a sinner; i. e. God the Father willed Christ to be treated as a sinner, and one most wicked, by undergoing the most ignominious death of the cross. So speak Chrysostom, Theophylact, Œcumenius, &c. Without doubt some ellipse or other figure must be understood in the passage; for it would be a fearful blasphemy to say that Christ, although most innocent, and free from all sin, nay, most holy too, was really held in the judgment and estimation of His Father, a sinner and wicked. Thus elsewhere Christ is said to have been made a 'curse for us;' where again is a twofold figure, for *κατάρα* is put for *κατάρατος*, and the particle *ὡς* is understood. So that the sense is, Christ is treated as though He were accursed before God. Nothing worse than this could befal the most wicked man in this life, but execrable indeed were he who would teach that the 'Ever Blessed' Son of God was really in His Father's sight 'accursed.' 3rdly, it must be specially observed that the "righteousness of God" does not here mean the 'righteousness of Christ.' For the word 'God' in this passage, as in many other, is used peculiarly of God the Father, as distinct from Christ; and so since as we have said, "righteousness" is here put for 'righteous,' the words "that we might be made the righteousness of God in Him," i. e. in Christ, must be explained in this way,—that we might be made righteous before God, or that we might be accounted righteous of God for Christ's sake. This being taken for granted, it is plain that the passage must be thus explained; As Christ on account of us was made sin, or a sinner, so we for Christ's sake are made the righteousness of God, or righteous before God; i. e. as for our sins Christ has been treated by God as a sinner, although really He was free from sin; so we, on account of His righteousness and satisfaction, are treated by God as righteous, although really we are not perfectly righteous; to wit, our sins are forgiven us on our repentance, on account of Christ's sacrifice, and the right to eternal life is granted to us; so that this passage of the Apostle well confirms the Catholic doctrine of the satisfaction of Christ, while it cannot agree any way with

κατάρα. Gal. 3. 13.

ἀει εὐλόγητος. κατάρατος.

your doctrine of imputation. Lastly, I will add this above all, that your exposition of this clause is altogether opposed to the preceding words of the Apostle, ver. 19. For there St. Paul speaks clearly of the reconciliation made by the death of Christ, and of the non-imputation of sin, which is given to the world without restriction; whence followed the universal covenant of grace and salvation, which he calls the word of reconciliation; this same he expressly says had been committed or entrusted to him, and the rest of the Apostles, to be announced to the world. The words are, "To wit, that God was in Christ, reconciling the world unto Himself, not imputing their trespasses to them; and hath committed unto us the word of reconciliation." The interpretation of those who here explain the world by the 'elect' (not to speak more harshly) is bold and rash, and wholly without precedent, neither can it be confirmed by any passage of Scripture where it is evident that the word is taken in that sense. The source of the error is this: that it seems strange to good men that it should be said of the whole world, that God has reconciled it with Himself, still more that He has not imputed sins to it. But there is but little weight of reason in this; for the reconciliation made by Christ's death is expressly attributed by this Apostle in other places, even to the wicked, and men as yet strangers to a state of grace and salvation. For 'this reconciliation' means nothing else, than that Divine Justice has been so far satisfied by the death of Christ, that God is now not only inclined and ready, but, by a gracious covenant ratified with men, has bound Himself to grant forgiveness to all, and be at peace with all who, by faith and sincere repentance, will return to Him; henceforth on God's part nothing hinders but that men may be in very deed reconciled with Him. For that actual reconciliation is not meant in this passage is clear from hence, that the Apostle is expressly speaking of such a reconciliation of the world by the death of Christ, as preceded the very announcement of the Gospel or of the word of reconciliation, which was made to the world by the Apostles, much more the faith and conversion of the world to God. But that no one previous to faith and conversion is actually reconciled to God or justified, is declared

STRIC. XI.

2Cor.5.19.

τὸν λόγον τῆς καταλλαγῆς.

viz. Rom. 5. 10.

STRIC. XI. by Scripture in so many, and those so plain passages, that it is either intolerable ignorance or obstinacy to question it. The same is to be said of the other expression. For when God is said 'not to have imputed sins to the world' in Christ, the meaning is, that God, although He might have justly willed not to spare a whole world involved in sins, (as He willed not to spare the great multitude of offending angels,) but have punished by eternal death and utterly destroyed the whole human race, (this is to impute sins in the most proper sense and in the highest degree,) yet He was willing to spare them, and even, propitiated by the death of Christ, to enter into a covenant of grace with men, whereby forgiveness of sins and eternal salvation were promised to those who believed and truly repented; so that the saying of the Apostle that God, on account of Christ's propitiation, has not imputed sins to the world, is exactly the same as that of Clement, the intimate companion of the Apostle, (whose words will charm, even though ten times repeated,) "that God, for the sake of Christ's blood-shedding, offered the 'grace of repentance' to the whole world."

1 Cor. 1. 30. § 11. The third passage is: "But of Him are ye in Christ Jesus, who of God is made unto us wisdom and righteousness and sanctification and redemption." I answer: I cannot sufficiently admire your and some others' acuteness, that you can deduce from this passage your imputed righteousness. Your argument is of this sort:—Christ is made to us righteousness by God; therefore the righteousness of Christ is so imputed to us that it really becomes ours, and through it we are accounted perfectly righteous by God. Following this method of arguing, let us go on to the next words of the Apostle: "Christ is made to us sanctification by God;" therefore the holiness of Christ is so imputed to us that it becomes really ours, and through it we ourselves are denominated holy. But whoever heard, whoever dreamed, of imputed holiness, save an Antinomian or Libertine? Let us go back to the preceding words: "Christ is made to us of God wisdom;" therefore the wisdom of Christ is so imputed to us that it really becomes ours, and through it we ourselves are denominated wise. What trifling!! The sense of the passage is plain enough; in the Apostle's

words there is a constant metonymy of the effect put for the cause: "Christ is wisdom to us," i. e. through Christ alone we are imbued with true and heavenly wisdom: "Christ is our righteousness," i. e. we are justified through Christ alone: "Christ is our sanctification," i. e. through Christ alone we are gifted with a richer measure of the Holy Spirit: "Christ is our redemption," i. e. through Christ alone we are one time to be freed from death, which is called our redemption. Surely, you cannot here well interpret redemption of the satisfaction of Christ; since that has been plainly implied in the preceding words of the Apostle, "Christ is made unto us righteousness." So Theophylact has rightly explained the passage, "'Christ is to us wisdom, righteousness, sanctification, and redemption,' i. e. He has made us wise and righteous, and holy and free:" and again, "First He made us wise, delivering us from error, and teaching us the knowledge of God; then righteous, by giving us a remission of our sins; afterwards He sanctified us by the Holy Spirit; and thus bestowed on us a complete deliverance from all evils." On the passage in the Philippians 3. 8, 9, 10, I have said enough. From all I have said on the imputation of the righteousness of Christ, it is at length, I think, sufficiently clear, that you hold an imputed righteousness which is not true.

STRIC. XI

Rom. 8. 23. Eph. 4. 30.

Harm. Apost. II. Diss. xii. 6. p. 145.

§ 12. It remains to shew briefly the second point; viz. that you take away altogether all inherent righteousness. This also is sufficiently evident from your doctrine of imputed righteousness: for you hold such an imputation of the righteousness of Christ as is altogether incompatible with the necessity of inherent righteousness, as has been already shewn above. This, however, can be proved in other ways. You say, that you acknowledge inherent righteousness; but, though you affirmed it a hundred times, I could hardly believe it. If you had said that you acknowledged a holiness or good quality inherent in all justified persons, I had not objected: but you cannot acknowledge inherent righteousness in them, if you would speak consistently. To explain myself—Inherent righteousness can be called our righteousness in no other way than that we are made righteous through it, i. e. that it is a condition of our justification required in the Gospel covenant. But you deny this, and consequently take

STRIC. XI. away all inherent righteousness. All righteousness has reference to some law, standard, or rule, according to which it is exacted: and he is righteous, who performs what the law requires, by the rule of which he is to be judged: one thing then remains to be examined, by what law we are accounted righteous according to this inherent righteousness. Surely, by the law of grace or the Gospel. The law of grace says: "He who believes and repents," i. e. is grieved from the heart at his sins, detests and leaves them, and turns to God in Christ from a true love and sincere purpose of obedience, shall receive pardon of sin, and a right to eternal life and the blood of Christ: and he who afterwards, if he live, shall bring forth worthy fruits of repentance, and shall grow in righteousness and holiness, shall retain the grace of justification which he obtained, as long as he remains such; and accordingly, if he die in this state, shall be saved eternally. The performance of this condition is our righteousness according to the law of the Gospel, which requires this; and by the performance of this condition, we are through the same law determined to be righteous, i. e. we are not found guilty of having failed to perform the condition required in that law. Surely, he is blind who does not see that this our righteousness is subordinate (so to speak) to the righteousness of Christ, and entirely depends on it. For the law or covenant of the Gospel is founded and established in the blood of Christ. Christ obtained from the Father, that we should be judged by so gracious a covenant; and His most perfect righteousness and obedience was effectual with God to the end that our righteousness, though maimed and imperfect, should be accepted unto salvation, as if it were in truth completely and in all points perfect. These statements are plain and easy to be understood; but your continually repeated observations, both on imputed and inherent righteousness, are so intricate and perplexed, that the reader who reflects upon them will fancy he has fallen into some labyrinth, from which he will not easily be able to extricate himself.

STRICTURE XII.

ON I. DISS. iii. § 4. p. 21.

STRIC. XII.

After having treated at length of the law of Christ, by the rule of which all Christians are to be judged, and having proved that that law was no other than the moral law, the observance of which, joined with faith in Christ, proceeding from faith and tempered with the grace of God and the great indulgence revealed in the Gospel, is required by all as a necessary condition to the obtaining justification and salvation, I form my argument against the Antinomians. My words are: "These things being premised, there arises at length an unanswerable argument, in my opinion at least, against these Antinomians and Solifidians. Whoever is justified by God through Christ is acquitted by the law of Christ: but by faith alone without works no one is acquitted by the law of Christ: therefore, &c. The minor proposition alone of this syllogism wants proof, which may be thus given it. Whoever is acquitted by the law of Christ, must necessarily fulfil that law; but by faith alone without works no one fulfils the law of Christ. Therefore by faith alone without works no one is acquitted by the law of Christ." You meet these remarks thus: "In this argument which you cry out is unanswerable there is a great ambiguity of expression, unworthy of a theologian. The fraud lies in the words, 'the law of Christ.' The law of Christ means two things: 1. The moral law of God, which is not done away by Christ, but confirmed, and is enjoined on our consciences as the rule of obedience, with an obligation to follow it: but this is not put forward as the rule of our justification, as St. Paul declares in the plainest words Gal. 2. 16, 21. 2. The law of faith, as the Apostle calls that way of justifying a sinner which God has shewn forth in the Gospel through Christ. Now you confound these two things; and because the minor premiss of the former syllogism is diametrically opposed to St. Paul's words, Rom. 14. 28, you strive to prove it by playing with equivocal terms. 'Whoever is acquitted by the law of Christ, (suppose, by the righteousness of faith,) must fulfil that law. But by faith alone without works no one fulfils the law of

Rom.3.27.

STRIC. XII.

Christ, (i. e. the moral law). Therefore by faith alone without works, no one is acquitted by the Gospel-law of Christ.' Who does not see the equivocation and fallacy? although by faith alone without works no one fulfils the moral law, nay, though no one absolutely fulfils the moral law, and no one therefore can attain righteousness by the moral law, yet whosoever believes in God through Christ fulfils the Gospel-law of Christ concerning justification by faith in the blood of Christ, and on that ground is acquitted of the guilt of his sins. True and living faith is the sole condition of justification according to the Gospel-law of Christ. He who denies this after having seriously read through St. Paul's argument, is as impious as he is mad."

ANSWER TO STRICTURE XII.

§ 1. This stricture of yours is a mere atrocious calumny. Candour in controversy, especially theological controversy, I have always desired and sought after, keeping as far as possible from equivocations, deceits and underhand practices in all cases, more especially those on which the salvation of souls turns. Of such artifices the cause you have undertaken against the plainest truth may stand in need: but truth, which I am defending, has no need of such corners and hiding places. In this chapter I lay down first by way of foundation, (which is allowed by all the reformers,) that the word justification is a forensic or law term, and so in its first notion bears with it an idea of a law proceeding. Whence I infer, that in our justification, as in every law proceeding, before every thing else the law must first be laid down by the rule of which we are to be judged; consequently that no one is properly justified or acquitted who has not fulfilled the law by the rule of which he is judged. This being laid down, I go on to enquire what the law is, by the judgment of which we Christians must stand? By the plainest testimony of St. James the Apostle, I shew that the law by which we are to be judged is 'the law of liberty,' or 'the royal law,' i. e. of Christ our king, which among other things has this command, "Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself." At length I conclude, that the royal law of which

νόμος ἐλευθερίας.

νόμος βασιλικός.

St. James speaks, and by which he declares we shall be judged, is no other than the moral law as Christ set it forth and completed it, and delivered it from the Mount (standing in the place of Sinai) as His law to His disciples. I say and prove, that the observance of this law attempered by the grace of the Gospel is demanded by Christ of all Christians, as an absolutely necessary condition of His covenant. All this being premised and established, I then argue thus against the Antinomians, (whose cause I should be sorry to see defended by a divine of the English Church): Whoever is justified by God through Christ, &c. as above. In each proposition of each syllogism I meant the same law of Christ (without any equivocation): but not being able to overturn the grounds of my argument, you have feigned an equivocation at your own pleasure, that by this last resource you may escape the point of my weapon. STRIC. XII.

§ 2. But, my Censurer, the charge recoils on your own head. By a wretched and that a manifold fraud, you cheat and deceive your reader, or else you are yourself cheated and deceived. For 1st. you hold a twofold law of Christ as laid down in the Gospel, and imposed on us Christians. Hitherto I should have thought (following the great mass of divines) that there was but one law for Christians, as there is but one legislator. May I ask what divine in his senses ever dreamt of the distinction between the moral law of Christ, and the Gospel law of Christ? Is not the moral law, as far as it is a law of Christ, i. e. set forth by Christ, and imposed on Christians by the Gospel, (under which relation alone we have considered it in this chapter), the Gospel law?

§ 3. You say, 2ndly, that the moral law is not done away, but confirmed by Christ, and enjoined on our consciences as the rule of obedience, together with an obligation on us to go by it; but what that obligation is you do not explain. Pray tell me, tell me plainly, Are we bound to obey the moral law, as confirmed by Christ, at the hazard of our soul, or only by the bond of gratitude? If you affirm the latter, you embrace the pestilent heresy of the Antinomians, and with them all those absurd dogmas which you just now professed to abhor. But if you hold the former, you must confess that this law is put forth by Christ as the rule of our

STRIC. XII.

justification; i. e. that the sincere observance of that law is a condition absolutely required in the Gospel to our justification. The ground of the conclusion is, that as far as any thing is required at the hazard of the soul and as necessary to salvation, so far the same is required as necessary to justification; which I have proved above clearly in the examination of the Seventh Stricture, § 2—5. That the reader however may be better able to judge how what was there said may be applied to the present question, it must be observed that there is as it were a twofold observance of the moral law given to us by Christ, one which is conceived by the will and firm purpose of mind, and is fulfilled by the inward affection of the mind at least; the other which is perfected in very deed, or in holy living. An observance of the former kind is absolutely necessary to salvation; and consequently is necessary in order that a man may obtain the grace of the first justification. For God holds no one accepted to salvation, and consequently justifies no one who has not yet attained to that love of God and his neighbour which is "the end of the commandment," (i. e. the end which God intends in His law, and in which, however attained, He acquiesces,) or again to use the words of St. Paul, who is not yet endued "with faith perfected by love." The other observance of the law is required for salvation, on the supposition that God grant life, and consequently is required to retain and preserve the grace of justification. In a word, I would say that he who devotes himself to Christ, his King, and with firm purpose of mind promises obedience to 'the royal law' to be performed by the grace of Christ, has, according to the Gospel covenant, a right to salvation; but a right depending and granted on the condition of his performing in act the obedience which he has vowed, provided that God grant him life. Whence it is evident, that the observance of the moral law given by Christ, as far as it is required to salvation, so far also is required to justification. That first observance of the law is necessary for any one to acquire a right to salvation by the grace of God in Christ, i. e. be justified; but the other is required that any one may not fall from his right to salvation, i. e. lose the grace of justification once obtained. And,

τέλος τῆς παραγγελίας. 1 Tim. 1. 5.

therefore, turn any way you can, you must either yield on this point to my argument, or secede (which God forbid) to the camp of the Antinomians. STRIC. XII.

§ 4. 3rdly. Very unsoundly is the passage of the Apostle, Gal. 2. 16, 21, adduced by you to support your supposition. For the Apostle there is treating not of the moral law confirmed by Christ, the sincere observance of which joined with faith in Christ and proceeding from faith is required in the Gospel as a necessary condition for obtaining salvation; but either of the ritual law, the observance of which the Judaizing false Apostles taught was to be necessarily joined with faith in Christ, if a man would be saved, or of the whole Mosaic covenant which had been broken up by Christ the Mediator, and faith in Him. It pains one to repeat these things so often, which are so clear and evident, and which have been proved at length again and again.

§ 5. 4thly. Very dangerously do you interpret the law of works of which the Apostle speaks, (and which he opposes to the law of faith Rom. 3. 27,) as the moral law given by Christ to His disciples. Nay, I know not that any thing has ever been uttered or put forward by the most profligate Libertine, which is more absurd, more harmful and dangerous, than this interpretation of yours. See what I said in examination of Stricture X. § 3, whence it will be seen that this interpretation of yours is confined entirely to yourself, neither can it be defended by the authority of any approved writer, even among the latter divines, for they, when they call the moral law a law of works, mean the moral law not as it has been set forth and imposed by Christ on His disciples, as recited in the sermon by St. Matthew; (they were never so foolish;) but as, viewed without reference to Christ, it demands from man, at the peril of his soul, an exactness of most perfect virtue and unattainable obedience. But these also (if I may be allowed to say so) seem to me to have mistaken the Apostle's meaning. "The law of works or deeds" (as an old interpreter excellently hath it) is in truth nothing else with the Apostle than the Mosaic law viewed carnally and according to the letter, which requires many external and ritual works (more properly called ἔργα); and which as far as regards morality itself is content with

νόμος ἔργων.

STRIC. XII.

that righteousness which consists in external deeds; inasmuch as it only denounces death on the external acts of murder, adultery, &c., not on the inward sinful affections. That this is true, viz., that the law of works of which the Apostle speaks is the Mosaic law, viewed carnally and according to the letter, is evident from the whole context of the passage which is contained in vv. 27—30. The words are, "Where is boasting then? It is excluded. By what law? of works? Nay: but by the law of faith. Therefore we conclude that a man is justified by faith without the deeds of the law. Is He the God of the Jews only? Is He not also of the Gentiles? Yes of the Gentiles also: seeing it is one God, which shall justify the circumcision by faith and uncircumcision through faith." Here the Apostle proves that a man is not justified by the law of works by the argument that God is God not only of the Jews, but of the Gentiles also. Which reasoning plainly shews that St. Paul in this passage thought chiefly of that law of deeds or rites, which belonged to the Jews only, and as 'a middle wall of partition' divide them from the Gentiles. And this is no new interpretation; as the passage is thus explained (not to mention other ancient writers) by the ancient author of the Commentaries which are attributed to St. Ambrose, both where he writes on this passage, and in other places also. His words in the very beginning of his Preface to the Epistle to the Galatians [p. 209] are very remarkable: "Every one," he says, "who believes in Christ, and yet observes the law of works, does not understand Christ. Like as the Symmachians who derive their origin from the Pharisees, who keeping all the law call themselves Christians, &c. For if they understood that Christ was God, they would expect nothing from the law of works, i. e. from the new moons, the Sabbath, circumcision, discerning of meats," &c. These words are akin to what the same author writes on the Epistle to Galatians 3. 19. [p. 221.] "The law of works," he says, i. e. "that of Moses, was placed in the midst between the promise when first made, and the seed to whom the promise was made, i. e. between Abraham and the Saviour, and on this account was it given long after the promise was made, that by this distinction the law might be shewn to be one thing,

the promise another; that so the people of God separated from the Gentiles might be instructed in the fear of God, that they might be made worthy to receive the promise, which is Christ. It is called, however, the law of works, because it teaches what should be externally done according to God's command concerning sacrifices, the first-born, tithes, and all other things." But the 'law of works' did not exclude boasting for a twofold reason: first, there were Jews who could honestly allege an exact observance of this law both as regards its moral and its ceremonial duties. Such was St. Paul, who says that touching that external righteousness of the law he was actually 'blameless.' Such was the young man, who as regards moral duties boasted that he had observed the whole Decalogue almost from his very cradle. Mat. 19. 20. And so if this observance of the deeds of the law, if this external righteousness had sufficed to salvation, there would have been men who would have had no need of forgiveness of sins and a Redeemer's sacrifice. Lastly, for this external righteousness human will was commonly sufficient, and that special grace of the Holy Spirit, which is promised in the Gospel as exacting a spiritual righteousness, was not so necessary. It seemed worth while mentioning this by the way, because it is an observation of no small moment.—Let us proceed.

STRIC. XII.

ἄμεμπτος.

vid. Gal. 2. ult.

§ 6. 5thly. Herein you surely err grievously, in thinking that 'the law of faith' has been so called by the Apostle because it requires nothing besides faith, because it is fulfilled by bare faith, as a single virtue. The law of faith requires not faith alone, but 'faith perfected by love,' as the Apostle himself bears witness Gal. 5. 6; "In Christ Jesus neither circumcision availeth any thing, nor uncircumcision; but faith which worketh by love." What that faith perfected by love is, the same Apostle clearly explains in another place, 1 Cor. 7. 19; "Circumcision is nothing, and uncircumcision is nothing, but the keeping of the commandments of God." From the comparison of these passages it is evident that 'the keeping of the commandments of God,' i. e. the sincere observance of the commandments of God, (of those, viz., which are of universal and perpetual 'obligation,') is comprised by the Apostle under the law of faith. Hence in the

δι' ἀγαπῆς ἐνεργουμένη.

STRIC. XII. Church of Christ, in the age next after the Apostles, it was held to be catholic and orthodox to teach that man is justified by the moral precepts of the law, as well as to say that man is justified by faith; and those two modes of speaking were not thought to be any way inconsistent with each other. Irenæus the disciple of the apostolic Polycarp bears ample testimony, writing thus: "The Lord did not destroy the 'natural duties' of the law, by which a man is justified, (which were observed before the law was given by those who were justified by faith and pleased God,) but He extended and completed them." The whole chapter is well worth reading. What follows then? The law of the Gospel is therefore called 'the law of faith,' because all the obedience which it requires proceeds from faith in Christ, and as it were sprouts from it as its root, (whence it is called plainly "obedience of faith" Rom. 16. 21, and elsewhere,) and because it is accomplished by the grace of the Holy Spirit which is obtained by faith; because, lastly, it is by the efficacy alone of the promise, made and ratified by the blood of Christ, which is embraced by faith, and not by its own merit, that it has power to salvation. Whence it avails to salvation albeit it is imperfect. See Harm. Apost. II. Diss. v. throughout.

lib.iv.c.27. [c. 13. p. 242.]

§ 7. 6thly. You say that the moral law is fulfilled by no one; if you speak of the complete and absolutely exact fulfilling of the law, (of which you are evidently speaking,) true it may be, but it is nothing to the point. For my argument rests on other grounds, viz. these two: 1. That there is a certain observance of the law required from us at the peril of our soul, and as a condition, an indispensable condition, of our obtaining salvation. 2. The observance of the law, which is required for our salvation, is also required for our justification. How sure this latter ground is, I have already too often shewn. The former proposition no one but the lowest Libertine will dare deny; and whoso denies it is refuted by the most plain words of our Lord Himself. The whole of the law is comprised by Christ in these two things, viz. "that we love God above all things, and our neighbour as ourselves." That these two things not only can, but ought also to be performed by all who would be saved, is

Mat. 5. 19, 20; and 7. 21, 24, 27.

certain. There is a well-known passage of Irenæus, (which although it mostly aimed at the Marcionites, may be applied but too fitly to our Antinomians); "Since, therefore, both in the Law and in the Gospel, the first and chief precept is 'to love the Lord our God with all the heart;' and after that, the next like to it, 'to love thy neighbour as thyself;' it is manifest that there is but one and the same framer both of the Law and the Gospel. For whereas in both testaments the precepts of 'a perfect' life are the same, they shew that it was the same God, Who gave indeed particular precepts peculiar to each; while the more eminent and chief commands, without which it is impossible to be saved, He hath given the same in both." lib. iv. c. 26. in initio. [c. 12, 3. p. 241.]

§ 8. 7thly. You say that "true and living faith is the sole condition of justification according to the Gospel law of Christ." This I acknowledge to be most true, provided that 'living faith' be defined (as it should be) after the Apostle, "faith perfected by love." For such a faith fulfils (as I said) the whole law of Christ, of which I am speaking. Lastly, the reproaches which you throw upon me, calling me impious and mad, I cannot dwell upon: to such-like reproaches, with which I have been so often assailed, I am now well-nigh callous: my trust is in a good conscience, which is to me a wall of brass, to repel without trouble all the calumnies of my enemies. My fiercest adversaries must one day stand with me before the judgment-seat of Christ, to whose tribunal I (in other respects the chief of sinners) in this cause certainly, (I am speaking of the case in the main,) willingly and gladly appeal. Meanwhile, my Censurer, remember our Lord's saying, "By thy words shalt thou be justified, and by thy words shalt thou be condemned." Mat. 12. 37.

STRICTURE XIII.

ON I. DISS. iv. 4. p. 24.

In this chapter, after weighing the three acts of faith as they are commonly assigned by divines, (viz. knowledge, assent, and confidence), I shew satisfactorily that there is not one of them with which, viewed by itself, justification is necessarily linked. The two former acts of faith (as acts to

STRIC. XIII. which either very few, or none at all, attribute the power of justification) I am content but slightly to touch upon. The third act, however, which they call 'confidence,' I weigh with fuller and more accurate examination. Which examination I prefaced thus: "The remaining act of faith is called 'confidence,' and in this the Solifidians place their greatest confidence; we shall, therefore, more carefully consider what they say on this point. And first it would be very proper to enquire what they mean by this confidence; for they involve this subject in such intricate expressions, that it is scarcely possible to understand them; intelligibly and consistently to explain what they say upon it, requires more than mortal wit. Let him who thinks otherwise try, and however unwilling, he will be obliged to confess the truth of what has been asserted." In answer to this you write in the margin: "Although it be a difficult task to give an accurate definition of any thing, and the definition of spiritual grace, which is 'beyond the senses' and above the natural understanding, is by far the most difficult; yet it is not impossible to explain intelligibly the nature of saving faith (to use this expression), or the formal cause and the justifying act of faith. It is easier, indeed, to say what a thing is not than what it is. But this does not defy the power of words. It is proved that faith does not consist in the assent of the mind given to the Gospel, and that most strongly; because an incarnate devil can have this faith, just as the very devils believe both that God is, and that Jesus is the Christ. Simon Magus was convinced of the truth of the Gospel, and believed on account of the power of the Apostles' works. This fulness of faith, or assent of the intellect, although it be a disposition of the mind which precedes saving faith, is yet short of living faith. The same must be allowed of conditional trust, which is often ineffectual from the greater power of the flesh turning away from Christ's yoke." In the next page you add: "Allow me, according to the slenderness of my ability, to describe what it will be more comfort to experience within, than to speak aloud. The saving faith of the elect is a lively inclination of the will, (guided by the intellect which has been enlightened by the Gospel, and moved by the Holy
1 Pet. 1. 21. Spirit,) to trust in God through Christ, or in Christ the

STRIC. XIII.

Mediator, for the obtaining eternal salvation, or for the obtaining pardon and life through the mercy of God and the merits of Christ. The formal act of living faith is, throwing away all hope of salvation in the world or oneself, with the whole heart to put confidence in God and Christ for the obtaining of the promises offered in the Gospel, on account of and through the goodness of God, His truth and power. By this faith or confidence Abraham glorified God." Not content with this, you bid me turn to the spare leaf at the beginning of the book, where you give a long explanation of your idea of justifying faith in these words: "We are treating of the proper idea of saving faith, and that peculiar act which the Scripture expresses by 'believing in or on God,' 'or Christ,' and 'on or in the name of the Lord.' The Greek interpreters of the New Testament very often use the words ἐλπιζειν εἰς τὸν Θεὸν for the same expression which the writers of the New Testament render by πιστεύειν εἰς Θεὸν and εἰς Χριστὸν. But I conceive the primary act of faith, and its formal cause, (so to speak,) to be the confidence in God or Christ for salvation in every way, which God promises us through Christ; and this confidence, by which man rests on God, and throws all his burden and care upon God, placing all his hope in God alone, and flying to God as to a rock, and upon Him building himself as upon a rock, is distinct from believing, as also from acting; and further still removed (viz. by two degrees) from the persuasion of the favour of God in the pardon of our sins; which full assurance some would wrongly have to be justifying faith, but which you, most learned Sir, powerfully refute. A man must be just before he knows he is justified; but a man is just by faith, and therefore faith, by and on account of which any one is justified, precedes the certainty of one's justification. This persuasion presupposes the knowledge of our own faith, and results by way of syllogism from the general proposition of the Gospel, and the assumption or reflex apprehension of our state in faith: whence a Christian, knowing that he has fulfilled the condition of the Gospel, is satisfied of his pardon and reconciliation with God. I mention these things that you may know that I am glad to agree with you, and that it is only when

τὸ πιστεύειν εἰς or ἐπὶ τὸν Θεόν.

ἐπὶ or εἰς ὄνομα and ἐν ὀνόματι Κυρίου.

STRIC. XIII.

compelled by the force of truth, that I dissent from you. The proper act, however, of justifying faith, I hold to lie between that conditional trust by which a man is persuaded that he will be saved, if he submits to God's conditions, &c. and the fruit of faith, which is obedience. Truly hath the philosopher said, *Τὰ ἐναντία παράλληλα μᾶλλον γνώριμα*, 'contraries, when side by side, are seen more prominently.' The corrupt flesh is not only guilty of incredulity, because it receives not in faith and with firm assent the word of God, but despises it; but is chargeable also with unbelief, or rather distrust, and a sinner dares not rely in security on the goodness and power of God, and trust to the promises of God. This depravity of an unbelieving heart is the mother of disobedience. One need not relate at length the rebellion of the Israelites in the wilderness, and the well known example of the Samaritan nobleman. It will be evident to him who weighs the matter, that the fault of distrust is an evil in addition to that of incredulity. On the other side, it is evident that a soul touched with Divine grace, and constrained by the gentle influence of the Holy Spirit, is converted to God, and looks to God with an inclination of the will; and not only assents to the truth of His promises, and is moved heart and soul to embrace them, but also puts its trust in God, and clings most closely to God, as holy Job says, that he will trust in God, even though He slay him. This trust begets a readiness to obey. A traveller who trusts in an experienced and faithful guide, follows his guide securely in a path unknown to him. Abraham, relying on the gracious providence of God, followed God into an unknown land with a blind but most wise obedience. The sick man, conscious of the skill and benevolence of his physician, if he dare trust him, (for this confidence follows belief, as it may happen,) will obey the prescriptions of his physician. Thus, he who labours under sin, if he believe that all his safety lies in the mercy of God and the merits of Christ, and trusts in God and Christ, i. e. rests in confidence on Them, will obey Christ most gladly. Meantime the root, although it bear fruits as occasion demands and produces them, must be distinguished from the shoot itself. By force of the promise, 'He that believeth in Him, he that buildeth on that stone elect precious,

Job 13. 15.

shall be saved;' 'the just shall live by faith,' though, like the believing thief, he die the next moment: justifying faith is therefore confidence. For this distinction is clear: we 'believe' the word of truth; we 'hope' for what is promised; and we 'trust in' the Promiser, Who is faithful and powerful. Injunctions as to this trust are of constant occurrence, Ps. 37. 3, 5, Isa. 26. 4. Many benefits are annexed to this faith by Divine promise, Ps. 2. 12, and 32. 10, and 37. 40. Splendid instances of this are put before us, Ps. 22. 4, 2 Chron. 13. 18. They are acts of the same kind, by which we trust in God for external protection in this life, and for eternal salvation in the next. For there is one common nature of faith by which the servant of God puts his trust in Divine Mercy, in His Truth and Power, secure and most certain of obtaining any promised benefit. Of the same kind is the faith by which David trusted in God for victory and for pardon; nay, by which Christ Himself, Who needed not pardon, trusted in God: this trust, I say, is of the same kind with the confidence of a Christian, by which he trusts in God and Christ for deliverance from sins. I will add one other argument only, the strength of which I would have you try; it is taken from the law of opposites. When the vice, wherein the sin consists in the affection being ill placed, is opposed to virtue, the act in both cases, i. e. both in the vice and in the virtue, is the same in kind. When a man is forbidden or found fault with for trusting in himself, or his own wit or strength, Prov. 3. 5; resting in riches or uncertain Mammon, Ps. 52. 7, 1 Tim. 6. 17; in princes of men, Ps. 118. 8, 9, and 146. 5; in an arm of flesh, Jer. 17. 5, 7: lastly, trusting in iniquity itself and rapine, Ps. 62. 10, Isa. 47. 10,—the fault that is charged against him is no other than the trust he places in certain objects. For no one is said to 'believe (*auro credere*) gold;' but one is said to trust in riches, when he counts his own riches as a tower of security and as a stay of happiness, and rests on external things. With equal reason faith in God and Christ is properly trust, by which we trust in the mercy of God and the merits of Christ. And, although there are various exercises of that faith, by which a Christian lives and walks, there is one common ground of all acts of faith, though the objects (of such faith) be various. As it was by

STRIC. XIII.

Rom. 10. 11. Isa. 28. 16.

Mat. 27. 43.

Jer. 17. 7.

STRIC. XIII.

a glance of the same kind that the Israelite saw both the sand that would not profit him, and the brazen serpent lifted on a pole, at sight of which he obtained salvation; so with a like eye of faith the Christian looks to Christ, his Redeemer, and God, his Protector: and with the same confidence rests on the good promises of God for sufficient provision and supply for his journey, and for pardon and eternal life; and this faith, taken in this sense, is most plainly taught by Christ and His Apostles to be the condition of justification. You see, then, it is not so hopeless a task to conceive and explain the idea of reliance or trust in God, if we give attention to the different expressions made use of by the Holy Ghost," &c.

ANSWER TO STRICTURE XIII.

§ 1. In this Stricture you have proved my words, which you meant to refute, to be most true, by a notable example. I said that they who hold confidence to be the formal act of justifying faith, when they come to explain their meaning involve the subject in such intricate expressions, that it is scarcely possible to understand them. Can any thing be more intricate than your words? I will endeavour to answer what I understand, fairly, and with all possible perspicuity; as to the rest it must suffice to make guesses.

§ 2. First, it seems very strange to me, that it should be so arduous and difficult a business, as you openly confess, to explain intelligibly the notion which you hold, of justifying faith. Surely this is a most certain proof that such notion is not genuine, but thoroughly spurious and false. For what man in his sober senses will you persuade that the one duty of man, on which by God's will his justification and eternal salvation depends, is so difficult to be explained? I have ever held that there are mysteries of Gospel doctrine, to be apprehended by faith, which can scarcely, nay which cannot be explained to the capacity of our weak intellect: but that the faith which is prescribed to us as our duty, is so great a mystery, I should never have dreamt till now. You have a cure of souls, and feed a Christian flock: but I am at a loss to conceive how you deal with your people. Doubtless

you have (or you are more fortunate than your brethren), among your hearers *some* of slow understanding: How will poor silly folk be able to understand, what their teacher, who is an educated man, has the greatest difficulty to explain even to learned men? Allow me, I pray you, to state things as they are. You have turned from the plain path of truth, to pathless and abrupt ways, and are entangled among thorns and thickets, so be not angry with me if I civilly point out to you the right way. Turn to the passages in Scripture in which the faith which avails to justification and salvation is avowedly explained, especially the texts so often brought forward, Gal. 5. 6, and 6. 15, compared with 1 Cor. 7. 19. You will see (unless you shut your eyes), that the faith to which, according to the Gospel covenant, justification and salvation is granted, is by no means a single virtue, but that the word is taken in a complex sense, and that justifying faith is nothing else than a firm assent to the Gospel in the understanding, which is effectual in the will through the true love of God and our neighbour; or that sort of assent to the Gospel which is accompanied by a reformation of the whole man, his heart and actions, or a sincere observance of what is taught in the Gospel.

§ 3. It must be observed that your definition of justifying faith, when given in your own words, is very lame and imperfect: and accordingly you use many words for a more full explanation of it, and these are metaphorical, and such as it is a want of skill to use in the definition of a thing. You say that the formal 'cause' of justifying faith is "confidence in God or Christ, for salvation in every way which God promises us through Christ." But who does not see that in this definition there is no essential difference expressed by which a saving faith may be distinguished from the faith of hypocrites? It is most certain that too many conceive in their mind a confidence of obtaining salvation by Christ, who are farthest off from a state of justification and salvation. Aware of this, as I fancy, you seek refuge in the shade of metaphorical expressions. "This confidence," you say, "by which a man reclines on God, acquiesces, and throws all his care and burden on God, taking refuge with God as on a rock," &c. I know that some of these metaphors

STRIC. XIII. are also found in the Scriptures: but I also know that they are not used to illustrate the point in question; where they do occur, the question is not of 'justifying confidence,' but 'of the confidence of a righteous man,' as will appear presently. But when what is required on our part to justification, is every where in the sacred oracles explained in plain words, why do you leave these, to use figurative expressions? The reason is evident. Your definition (as being too scanty, jejune and squalid) would disgust a reader at first sight, were it exhibited at once in its native colours; and so you must wash it over with the paint of metaphor, to impose on him.

§ 4. It is worthy of remark that among the metaphors which you use to explain the formal cause of saving faith, there are some which, resolved into their proper meaning, plainly imply that very love, or sincere purpose of obedience, which I willingly acknowledge to be the complement and perfection of truly justifying faith. Thus you say, when about to describe your justifying confidence, that "the soul touched with Divine grace, and constrained by the gentle influence of the Holy Spirit, is converted to God, and by a voluntary inclination looks to God, nay, most firmly cleaves to Him." Certainly the turning of the soul to God, in the Scriptures denotes repentance, which embraces, as is well known, the whole condition of salvation required on our part in the new covenant. But what else can that closest cleaving of the soul to God mean, than the divine virtue of love, by which a man desires above all things the favour of God, and courts His love, determined, so that he may obtain and preserve that love, on obeying God's commandments, in spite of all the temptations of the world, the flesh, and the devil, and on persevering, by the grace of God, in that obedience unto death? If while you use these metaphors you do not mean this, I entreat you, say plainly what you do mean. So wholly impossible is it intelligibly to explain any trust in God, bringing with it the saving effect of justification, which does not, when so explained, include in its meaning the true love of God and a sincere purpose of obedience.

§ 5. Trust, which you hold to be the chief act of justifying faith, you assert is "further removed by two degrees

from πληροφορία or full assurance of God's favour in the forgiveness of sins;" but you so describe that trust, that it does not seem to be one step removed from full assurance. For first you call that trust 'confidence:' now this word (except that by good writers it is generally used in a bad sense) means a sure and undoubted persuasion about something; but the metaphors you use insinuate the same full assurance. For, "for a man to rely and rest in God, to cast all his care (viz. of obtaining eternal salvation) upon God, to take refuge with God as a rock, and to build himself on Him as upon a rock," these expressions of yours, I say, surely point to some security of mind as to obtaining salvation. What must one think of your expressly defending a security of this kind? You say afterwards, that "it is one common nature of faith by which the servant of God puts his trust in the mercy, truth and power of God, when he is most secure of obtaining any promised benefit." Tell me, how does this most sure security, which you defend, differ from that full assurance which you reject. If you say, that this most sure security regards only the truth and power of God in performing promises, by which forsooth we are persuaded that God will make good His promises, provided we perform the conditions of the same, you are plainly shirking the question, for you yourself distinguish that conditional trust from the confidence to which you attribute justification: and it is plain also, that that trust of itself is not sufficient for justification. By the way I remark that in the words next quoted by me, you speak of the trust of the 'servant of God' as to obtaining a promised benefit. But you should remember, my Censurer, that it is no question as to the trust of a man who has already become a servant of God, (for we do not deny that such a man may rightly conceive in his mind great confidence of obtaining promised benefits,) but of the trust of a sinner striving to extricate himself from the slavery of sin, and aspiring to the free service of God. Nay, you speak distinctly about trust which precedes all one's obedience, and even readiness to obey, and to this trust you attribute justification. But what sort of servant of God, I pray, is he who has not yet served God, nay who has not yet bound himself in will to God's service? and what trust

STRIC. XIII.

STRIC. XIII.

can a man of this sort conceive in his mind of obtaining the promises of God, except that conditional trust, by which he is persuaded that he shall obtain the promised benefits, if he perform the condition, i. e. provided he becomes in truth a 'servant of God?'

§ 6. In my Dissertations I have used the distinction of a twofold trust: the one absolute, by which a man held in doubt by no condition believes that his sins are actually forgiven, and that he is accepted by God unto salvation: the other conditional, by which a man trusts in the Gospel promise, that he shall obtain forgiveness of sins, and likewise eternal salvation through Christ, if only he perform the condition of obtaining forgiveness prescribed in the Gospel. I have allowed my opponent to take which of these two kinds of trust he chooses, to which to attribute a man's justification: assured that to neither can a man's justification be attributed without manifest absurdity. You reject each of these kinds of trust from justification, and yet pertinaciously maintain that there is a trust, which is the primary act of justifying faith and as it were its formal cause. You allow that I have satisfactorily refuted the opinion of those who hold that justifying faith is absolute trust of forgiveness of sins already obtained; and yet you attribute justification to a trust distinct from conditional trust. I admire your cleverness in that you are the first philosopher who has found a mean between two contradictories. Is there, I pray you, any trust, which neither depends, nor does not depend, on a condition? If you try to get off by saying that the justifying trust, which you contend for, is indeed conditional, but yet is wholly different from the conditional trust I have described, it will be of no avail. For, first, you will never be able to explain to us any conditional trust which is really a bare confidence, and which is not exactly the same as that conditional trust which I have described. Whatever you add to that description, it will be evident that it is an act not of faith or trust, but of love. This is what I have already said in this chapter of my Dissertations. "It is evident that this conditional confidence can contribute nothing to a man's justification and future happiness, except you suppose it to act upon his will and affections by producing some act of love

in the soul, and by strongly stimulating the whole man to seek those blessings of the Gospel which he believes both to exist and to be attainable by him." What I ask is fair: bring forward some day a description of justifying trust, (not in metaphorical, as is your wont, but in plain terms,) and I engage to submit myself to you forthwith. Secondly, it cannot be affirmed that this conditional trust, whatever it may be, or however you may describe it, is sufficient of itself to man's justification or salvation, without a most evident contradiction. For from the very fact that this trust depends on a condition, it is plain that it is of no avail to a man's justification or salvation, except that condition be performed, otherwise there would be a fallacy in the trust itself: e. g. I trust, resting on the promise of the Gospel, that I shall obtain forgiveness of sins and so eternal salvation, if only I heartily repent of my sins, and devote myself to Christ our Lord, and a holy life according to the order of His Gospel; and I believe that otherwise I cannot obtain pardon and salvation. If now this trust could of itself, without the performance of the condition of repentance, obtain justification, there would plainly be a fallacy in the trust by which I was persuaded that I should obtain forgiveness of sins on condition of repentance, and not otherwise; consequently a man would by a false persuasion obtain justification and salvation.

1. Diss. iv. 5. p. 25.

§ 7. But perhaps you will take refuge in the opinion of those who hold that the trust by which we are justified is a trust (as they say) "of special mercy: by which a man believes and holds individually, that our Saviour Jesus Christ has made most full satisfaction for his sins, and that consequently forgiveness of sins, righteousness and eternal life, is offered not only to others, but himself also; and that of the free gift and mercy of God for the merit of Christ alone." This is held in so many words by some of our reformed writers, in other respects most learned men. These writers teach also, that this trust is wholly different from that conditional trust which I have described; and yet is not the same with an absolute trust, by which a man believes that his sins are actually forgiven. For these same doctors expressly define that "the act of saving faith, which is the

STRIC. XIII.

instrumental cause of justification, is not a trust that pardon or forgiveness of sins has been obtained, but a trust of obtaining pardon." Could I judge of your meaning from so confused and perplexed an argument, I should think that these doctors had exactly and fully expressed your opinion; but that the reader may escape from this labyrinth, we must observe carefully, that the trust by which a man holds that forgiveness, righteousness and salvation is offered not only to others, but himself also, depends either 1. on the faith of a general promise made in the Gospel, or 2. on a persuasion of his particular and absolute election to salvation, which has been determined on by the secret will and decree of God, and made known to him by some immediate revelation. If those teachers mean the former, we willingly allow that every man, to whom the Gospel is made known, not only can, but ought to believe, that to him in particular, forgiveness, righteousness, and so eternal life in Christ is seriously offered, and that he shall certainly obtain forgiveness, righteousness, salvation, if he continues in the way set forth in the Gospel; since the promise is to all. But 1. This trust is falsely called one of 'special mercy,' unless, with the Confession of Augsburg, we mean by special mercy, "that mercy which is a special, free, and undeserved favour, and is opposed to the worthiness of contrition or other works either precedent or consequent." 2. This trust can be no other than that conditional trust by which a man trusts that he will obtain forgiveness, righteousness, and eternal salvation by and through Christ, if he heartily repent of his sins, and shall for the future obey Christ's precepts. For the universal promise was made by this law: and therefore no sinner, who is not yet justified, can by the force of the promise conceive in his mind, and trust that he will obtain forgiveness and salvation, other than that conditional trust which I have described: all which is plain. If, however, they mean the latter, viz. that a trust of special mercy, by which a man believes that to him in particular forgiveness and salvation in Christ are offered, rests on a persuasion of his particular and absolute election, immediately revealed to him by the Spirit, then must they fall into the grossest absurdities. For (not to mention other things) in the first

place, this opinion turns Christian faith into mere enthusiasm, than which nothing is more dangerous. Secondly, this opinion entirely inverts the right order, acknowledged and received by all the more sound divines. I will not here enter on the question of predestination, which I could heartily wish was for ever buried in oblivion; although there is no want of learned divines who strongly contend that by the doctrine of election, as it is taught by many, all such justification of a man at God's tribunal as takes place in time, is utterly overturned. But I will argue from what is granted on both sides. All the sounder divines allow (both those who teach that the decree of election is absolute and irrespective, as those who contend that that decree is founded in Christ, and consequently has reference to men planted in Christ by a living and persevering faith) that the knowledge and, as it were, sense of our election (that can be attained in this mortal life) follows upon faith, love, repentance, and so daily mortification, and cannot otherwise be realized but by these proofs. On the other hand, according to this opinion, a trust and persuasion of our election is held to be, as it were, the first step in the ladder of salvation, and men not yet justified, before any obedience, are taught to conceive this trust. A doctrine so foolish and absurd that it is not worth being refuted, but so impious and dangerous that it is worthy of all hatred and every anathema. Nor must they be heard who have dared to assert, as though to their reproach, that this is the doctrine of all the reformed Churches. It is clear that this is false. For 1st, it is certain that almost all the Churches which follow the Confession of Augsburg, i. e. the Lutheran, (which are most numerous,) not only do not admit the doctrine of absolute and irrespective election, but reject it as wholly fictitious, and consequently it cannot be, that according to the doctrine of these Churches, the object of justifying faith is held to be that special mercy which is founded in absolute election. 2ndly, the Augsburg Confession itself, which among the reformed Confessions is of all the first and best, plainly teaches in the chapter on "faith," that this special mercy of predestination is not an object of faith; for there the Augsburg divines make the object of *faith* the promise of mercy, which is made to us on account

STRIC. XIII.

of "Christ our Deliverer," which they plainly teach is universal. Their words are, "As the preaching of repentance is universal, so the promise of grace also is universal, and orders all to believe and accept the goodness of Christ." Nay, to shew that they do not mean this special mercy of election, they expressly add, "There is no need here of questions on predestination, for the promise is universal." 3rdly. Lastly, our English Church, Article XVII., expressly teaches that the consideration and perception of eternal election (which she expressly says is in Christ) is attained only by "godly persons, and such as feel in themselves the working of the Spirit of Christ, mortifying the works of the flesh and their earthly members, and drawing up their mind to high and heavenly things;" and at the end of the article recalls men from those curious speculations on predestination, (with the authors of the Augsburg Confession,) and refers them to the universal promise in these words: "Furthermore, we must receive God's promises in such wise, as they be generally set forth to us in Holy Scripture; and in our doings that will of God is to be followed which we have expressly declared unto us in the Word of God:" and these remarks (as by the way) I thought ought to be made as to the trust of a special mercy, to preclude you from all means of evasion. I now proceed in the examination of what follows in this Stricture.

§ 8. "The proper act of justifying faith," you say, "lies between that conditional trust, by which a man is persuaded that he will be saved if he submit himself to God's condition, &c., and the fruit of faith, viz. obedience." If here by obedience you mean the course and series of visible obedience, we allow that that by which we obtain primary justification (by whatever name you call it) is somewhat between that conditional trust and obedience of that kind. But it is plain that by 'obedience' you meant the promptness for obedience, or sincere purpose of obeying. For thus you speak shortly after—"this trust begets a readiness to obey. Meantime the root, though it bear fruits as occasion demands and produces them, must be distinguished from the shoot itself. By the force of the promise, 'He that believeth in Him, he that buildeth on that stone elect precious, shall be saved &c.; the just shall live by faith,' although he die the next moment

as the believing thief; justifying faith therefore is trust:" and so you hold that there is a sort of justifying trust which follows upon that conditional trust, and yet precedes all obedience, nay, precedes also the readiness to obey. What you hold is as dangerous as it is absurd. The arguments and examples or similes, by which you try to prove and explain this wonderful assertion, are futile and frivolous; nay, if they be well weighed, they fight plainly against you. STRIC. XIII.

§ 9. You argue thus: "Contraries placed side by side are seen more prominently, as the philosopher hath said truly. The corrupt flesh is not only guilty of incredulity &c., but also labours under infidelity, or rather distrust. It will be clear to any one who examines the matter, that the fault of distrust is an evil in addition to that of incredulity. Now on the other side it is evident" &c. I answer: 1st. Grant that distrust is another evil added to incredulity, what will follow thence from the rule of opposites? this only legitimately, that trust is another virtue added to credulity or assent. But what then? does it thence follow (which was incumbent on you to prove) that there is a justifying trust, which lies between conditional trust and obedience, or a readiness to obey? Of course not. 2ndly. But it is false that distrust (if you distinguish it as you should from the disobedience of the heart) is an evil, in addition to incredulity. Distrust and incredulity are the same things, provided they are referred to the same object, viz. a Divine promise. Does a man disbelieve or refuse his assent to a Divine promise of obtaining some benefit? From the very fact that he disbelieves the Divine promise, he distrusts it, nor is there here any difference, or that of no account, between incredulity and distrust. This is clear enough from the well-known examples, which you mention in passing, of the Israelites, when they rebelled in the wilderness, and the Samaritan lord. These did not believe, or give their assent, i. e. they had no confidence in the Divine promises made to them; so that their incredulity and distrust were exactly the same. But from this incredulity of mind there followed in them a disobedience of heart, which betrayed itself in corresponding words and deeds. So again, on the other side, 'credence' or assent, and 'trust' are the same thing, if you regard the same object, viz. a Divine

ἀπείθεια.

STRI'C. XIII.

promise. I believe, or I give my assent, to the Divine promise of eternal salvation to be given me by and through Christ, on some certain conditions; i. e. I trust in God, promising me salvation on these conditions. Who does not here see that my faith or assent, and trust are exactly the same things, and no way to be distinguished? But from this assent of the mind, or trust, (if by God's grace it be efficacious,) there follows ready obedience of heart, and firm determination of mind, by which one determines that one will submit oneself to God's condition (as you speak) in order to become partaker of the promised benefit. This ready obedience of heart is (if we speak properly) the effect of trust, not trust itself; as on the other hand disobedience of heart is the effect of distrust, not distrust itself properly so called. Hence it is clear that between distrust, by which a man disbelieves or distrusts the promise of God in the Gospel as to salvation, to be given to him on certain conditions by and on account of Christ, and that disobedience of heart by which he determines that he will not submit himself to the conditions of the Gospel, but will go on in his sins, there is no middle distrust; and on the other side, between conditional distrust, by which a man believes or trusts in the same Divine promise, and the obedience of the heart, by which a man seriously applies his mind to perform the conditions of the promise, there is no middle trust.

§ 10. The similes of the trust of a sick man in his physician, and of a traveller in his guide, by which you meant to prove and explain your opinion, are wholly foreign from your purpose. On the contrary, they serve most suitably for the elucidation of my doctrine. A traveller believes, i. e. trusts in a trust-worthy man who knows the way, and offers himself to him as a guide; consequently, if he seriously wishes to reach the end of his journey, he follows his guide securely in the way unknown to him. Here it is plain that, 1st, 'to believe and trust' a 'guide' are exactly the same thing. 2ndly, that there is no middle trust between that trust by which a traveller believes and trusts that he shall arrive at the end of his journey, if he take the road pointed out by his guide, and that purpose of mind by which he determines that he will follow the footsteps of the same. How this may

be applied to our purpose, every one may see. Likewise the patient believes, i. e. trusts in his physician, (whom he knows to be skilled in his art, and to be an honest man,) who promises him health; whence (if nothing persuade him to the contrary) he obeys the prescriptions of his physician. Here again credence (as you call it) and trust are the same thing; only it is not true that trust follows belief contingently, which you affirm. Here also it is clear enough that between the conditional trust, by which a sick man believes and trusts he shall recover his health if he use the remedies prescribed by his physician, and that purpose of mind by which he determines he will follow the prescriptions of his physician, there is no middle trust. You affirm absolutely that the sick man who trusts in his physician obeys his prescriptions, which is most false. He does not always obey who trusts. For it may happen that the physician thinks abstinence in food and drink necessary, and so prescribes that which the sick man, enslaved to a contrary inveterate habit, cannot or will not bear. Or it is possible that the disordered stomach of the sick man nauseates the prescribed remedy, (which otherwise he doubts not would be available). Lastly, it is possible that the remedy may be so severe, and joined with so much pain, (i. e. if a limb is to be cut off, *ne pars sincera trahatur*,) that a delicate patient, though he by no means distrusts the advice of his physician, would rather die than go through it. Perhaps no instance in human things could be brought forward, which would be more suited to our purpose. We are all ill with the fatal disease of sin. We have a Physician sent from heaven, Jesus Christ our Saviour. He promises us salvation, and that eternal, without price, provided we refuse not to obey His most wholesome counsel, and use the remedies prescribed in the Gospel. He who believes or gives his assent to Christ promising, trusts in that same Christ, so that you may look in vain for any difference here between assent and trust, or any middle trust between this same trust and that firm purpose by which a man determines that he will walk in the way pointed out by Christ of obtaining eternal salvation, and will continue in it to his life's end. It is possible also, and alas! is too often the case, that he who believes and trusts in

STRIC. XIII.

Christ promising salvation, has not yet brought himself to determine to walk in the way pointed out by Christ of obtaining salvation. That this is too true is proclaimed by sad experience, and clearly borne witness to by Holy Scripture, which expressly relates that there have been many who have believed in Christ and His Gospel, and consequently have trusted in His promises, which are no small part of the Gospel published by Him; and yet fear of danger or disgrace among men hath kept them from the confession of Christ, and consequently from salvation. The Apostle St. Paul also most plainly teaches that it is possible for a man to have 'all faith,' (which without doubt embraces a most firm assent to the whole Gospel, and so a most sure trust in the promises of the Gospel,) and yet be wholly estranged from love, and consequently from salvation. To insist still on your example of a sick man putting his trust in a physician, it often happens that he who trusts in Christ the Physician of souls, is averse to the prescribed means of spiritual medicine, as being most distasteful to the flesh. Christ requires us, if we will be saved, to leave off our accustomed habit of sin, which we find it hard to obtain from ourselves. The palate of the mind is vitiated, and no more relishes spiritual things than a sick man does the bitterest pill. Lastly, (which is most difficult of all,) right hands must in this case be cut off; eyes plucked out that the whole man perish not for ever.

Joh. 2. 23, 24; 12. 42.

πᾶσαν πίστιν.

1 Cor. 13. 2.

Compare Mat. 7. 21—23.

Mat. 5. 29, 30.

§ 11. How the instance of the believing thief has reference to your proposition I do not see. Think you that that thief obtained justification and salvation by mere trust, without any obedience, external or internal, nay, without any readiness for obedience? You err grievously. Hear Davenant, who after he had thoroughly proved the necessity of good works to justification, in addition to his arguments adds this very example of the believing thief in these words: "Lastly, let us illustrate and support these arguments by a well-known example. If ever any justified person was utterly without good works, this must have been especially the case in the thief, who was converted in the last act of his life. But if we consult the Evangelist St. Luke, we shall find that he was eminent in many and great good works. As regards

de Justif. act. c. 30.

external works, he humbly confesses his sin, calls his companion to the fear of God and repentance, and acknowledges Christ hanging on the cross, deserted by His followers, derided by His enemies, as the giver of a heavenly kingdom. These were external works, the best and brightest he could have displayed at such a time. If we look to internal works, without doubt he grieved and repented truly and heartily of the crimes of his past life, he hoped also for his companion (which was an instance of his love) repentance and salvation, he believed firmly in Christ his Redeemer, and lastly, testified his fear and love towards God." STRIC. XIII.

§ 12. You say, "This distinction is clear: we believe the word of truth: we hope for what is promised: and we trust in the Promiser who is faithful and powerful." What then? Does it hence follow that there is a trust which is neither absolute trust nor the conditional trust which I have described? you would not deduce this conclusion from this distinction by the help of ten inferences. There are some things, however, in this clear distinction, which require to be noted and stigmatized. First, then, you have done wrong in putting trust in a faithful and powerful Promiser in the last place, when it ought to have been in the first. For all the assent or trust which we have in any promise, is posterior to the trust which we place in a faithful and powerful Promiser, and depends upon it. Thus for instance, I trust in the promises of God, i. e. I am persuaded that God will be true to the faith of His promises, or will perform His promises, because I trust in the faithful and powerful God Himself, or I am fully persuaded of the faithfulness and power of God. This is plain from the examples which you have adduced. Thus the sick man trusts in the promise of his physician to restore him to health if he use the remedies prescribed, because he has confidence in the physician, as a good man, and one skilled in his art, &c. In a matter so plain we need not say more, and therefore it is absurd in you to a degree to place trust in God or Christ, as a faithful and powerful Promiser, last in order as the perfection of justifying faith. For whoever assents to the Word of God or Christ, trusts in God or Christ, as a faithful and powerful Promiser, since such an assent cannot be given without that trust. But you yourself

STRIC. XIII.

allow, and we have clearly proved, that a wicked man, one quite a stranger to the state of justification, may give this assent. Secondly, most falsely and most dangerously you refer the hope of the promise to justifying faith, or to that trust which precedes a man's justification. For hope is nothing else than the expectation of a future good; and theological hope is the expectation of obtaining a future good, i. e. eternal salvation, from God or Christ. This expectation depends on a man's firm persuasion either that he will, or certainly that he can, gain eternal salvation. That you did not mean here by "hope" such an expectation of salvation as rests on a man's persuasion that he *can* obtain eternal salvation, is plain from hence, viz. that this persuasion is exactly the same as that conditional trust which you reject as insufficient for a man's justification. Therefore by "hope" you must here mean such an expectation of eternal salvation as arises from a man's persuasion that he *will* obtain eternal life; and this expectation (as I have observed in my Dissertations) is more properly called "hope" in Holy Scriptures. But this hope or expectation follows upon our performance of the condition required for justification, and consequently upon our justification itself. For with what right can any one expect eternal salvation, if he has not yet performed the things required for justification, (without which there can be no salvation)? You see now, I hope, the errors and illusions there are in this distinction, which you call "clear." Nevertheless, to make the matter still more clear, I will here set forth the true and most clear distinction between the various acts of Christian faith, trust, and hope. The order is this: First, we believe that our Lord Jesus is the Christ, and the most true and mighty Son of God. Hence we believe the whole of His Gospel, and trust most especially in His promises. Next (if this faith and trust be made efficacious in us by God's grace) we seriously apply our minds to perform the condition of these promises, viz. by repenting of our sins, by conceiving a firm purpose of obedience, and by devoting ourselves to Christ our King. Lastly, by performing the condition, we hope for the thing promised: which hope is more or less perfect in proportion to, and according to the measure of, our obedience, or as it

Joh. 9. 35; 20. 31. Acts 8. 37. 1Joh. 4. 15; 5. 5.

is more or less clear to us that we have performed the condition. Here every thing is clear. Shall I also illustrate and support this by the example which you have adduced? A sick man is persuaded that his physician is a good man and skilled in his art. Hence he trusts in his promise of restoring him to health, if he obey his prescriptions. Then (if, as befits a wise man, he consults his own health) he submits himself to the prescriptions of his physician, determining to try all remedies, however disagreeable, in order to get rid of his disease. Lastly, by obeying the prescriptions, he has a good hope of recovering his health. But a sick man would be a fool and a madman (and therefore only fit to set sail for Anticyra) who expected to be made well by a physician while refusing to take his advice and use the prescribed remedies. This, in fact, is your great mistake, the source of all your errors, that you have not accurately distinguished between the hope of a promised blessing, which is consequent on a Christian's performance of his duty, and the trust in a promise, which precedes justification indeed, but is not of itself sufficient to obtain it. STRIC. XIII.

§ 13. The exhortations to trust that meet one in every page of Scripture, the very great promises annexed to these precepts, lastly, the splendid examples of the same, which you adduce, neither help your cause at all, nor injure mine. For the passages in which these precepts, promises, examples, occur, besides that they generally refer to advantages of this life, speak most plainly of the trust of a righteous man; and that, too, resting on the goodness and power of God in the way of righteousness. But that it is the privilege of a righteous man that he may, his duty that he should trust securely, in his greatest affliction, in Almighty God, and "commit the keeping of his soul to Him in well-doing," 1 Pet. 4. 19. (with which must be compared Ps. 37. 3, which is at the head of your quotations); that it is to this trust of a righteous man that the greatest promises in Scripture are annexed, that it is of this same trust that we find the splendid examples in Scripture, no one can doubt. But this wretched reasoning, displayed so often in your Strictures, compels me to ask again, What then? For I see no inference to be drawn hence, which at all favours your absurd hypothesis. Let me

STRIC. XIII.

remind you, then, again, my dear Sir, that it is incumbent on you to prove one or other of these two things: either, 1st, that a sinner, one not yet justified, has any right to conceive in his mind a trust that he will obtain eternal salvation, other than that conditional trust which I have so often described; or, 2ndly, that this conditional trust is of itself sufficient to the justification of a sinner. The latter you deny; the former you will never prove. Certainly, those precepts, promises, examples of Scripture, as they have been adduced by you, are nothing to the purpose.

§ 14. I come now to your Achillean argument. You say: "I will add one other argument only, the strength of which I would have you try; it is taken from the law of contraries. When a man is forbidden or found fault with," &c. But whoever examines this argument also, of the strength of which you boast so much, will pronounce it at once to be downright touchwood. For, in the first place, with all your attempts you effect nothing, trying to prove from many passages of Scripture that, as often as a man is forbidden to trust in any thing else than God, what is blamed in him is trusting. For, who in his senses will deny that (*fidere*) 'to *trust*,' means (*fiduciam*) 'trusting?' 2ndly. Your observation, that a man is not rightly said *auro* &c. *credere*, is silly enough: for *credere* means sometimes the same as *confidere*. Thus Virgil:

"Nimium ne crede colori."

And Ovid:

"Moribus et vitæ credidit ille meæ."

And you find examples of this continually in good authors. 3rdly. When you say, "with equal reason 'faith in God' is properly trust," you do not rightly state your parity of reason, which should rather have stood thus: When a man is forbidden to trust in himself, &c. what is blamed in him, is trust: with equal reason, when a man is enjoined to trust in God or Christ, 'what is enjoined him' is in like manner trust. Not all faith in God or Christ is trust: but that faith only, which looks to God as a Promiser. But what you elicit hence, that has even a show of argument to support your hypothesis, I cannot divine.

§ 15. Except, indeed, you meant that by the phrase (*credere in Deum* sive *Christum*), 'to believe in God or Christ,' some peculiar trust is denoted in Scripture, which none but they who believe unto justification and salvation have. In this sense, indeed, you speak at the beginning of your longer Stricture above cited; where you say in so many words, that "the Scripture expresses the proper idea of saving faith as well as the peculiar act, by 'believing in or on God, or Christ,' (*τὸ πιστεύειν εἰς* or *ἐπὶ τὸν Θεὸν* or *Χριστὸν*,) 'and on or in the name of the Lord,' (*ἐπὶ* or *εἰς ὄνομα* and *ἐν ὀνόματι Κυρίου*"). But this criticism of yours neither has any thing in it, nor is it true, since it is certain that *πιστεύειν εἰς Χριστὸν* is said in the Scriptures of those who had not yet believed unto justification and salvation. See the plainest passages, John 2. 23, 24, and 12. 42, 43. The phrase *πιστεύειν εἰς τινα*, occurs no where (that I know) among profane Greek writers, but is an idiom of the Hebrew language, which was imitated by the writers of the New Testament. But it must be observed that there are two phrases in Hebrew, *credere alicui* and *credere in aliquem*; where distinction is rather of words than of things. Thus לא־האמין להם, *non credidit eis*, "he believed them not," Gen. 45. 26. אם־לא יאמינו לך והאמינו לקל האת האחרון, *si non crediderint tibi, ut credent voci signi posterioris*, "if they will not believe thee, they will believe the voice of the latter sign," Exod. 4. 8. ולא האמנתם לו, *et non credidistis Ipsi*, "ye believed Him not," Deut. 9. 23. ויאמינו ביהוה ובמשה עבדו, *et crediderunt in Dominum et in Mosen Ejus servum*, "they believed the Lord and His servant Moses," Exod. 14. 31. וגם־בך יאמינו, *etiam in te credent*, "and believe thee," Exod. 19. 9. From these examples it is evident that the phrases *credere alicui* and *credere in aliquem* were used promiscuously in Hebrew of God as of His creatures. Nay, so far is the phrase *credere in Deum* from signifying of itself justifying trust, that at times it does not signify trust at all. Thus of the Ninevites, who believed Jonah denouncing the destruction of their city in God's name, it is said ויאמינו אנשי נינוה באלהים, *et crediderunt viri Nineve in Deum*, "So the people of Nineveh believed God," Jon. 3. 5, where it is plain that by *credere in Deum*, trust is not signified. For trust

STRIC. XIII.

STRIC. XIII. always regards some promise; whereas in this passage the assent is expressed which the Ninevites gave to God's threatening, preached by Jonah concerning the destruction of their city. It has not escaped me that St. Austin somewhere has nicely (as is his wont) distinguished between these three, *credere Deo, credere Deum,* and *credere in Deum.* But to this distinction that great Father applies a Catholic and sound sense; and if you admit this sense, further question with you on the subject will be ended. For with St. Austin *credere in Deum* is nothing else than *amare Deum,* 'to love God.' He says, "*Non continuo qui credit Deo, credit in Deum; nam et dæmones credebant ei, et non credebant in eum.*" Again, we can say of His Apostles, *credimus Paulo,* but not *credimus in Paulum;* and he subjoins, "What, then, is to believe in God, (*credere in Deum?*) To love Him by believing, to choose Him by believing, to go to Him by believing, and to be incorporated among His members." Lastly, explaining the faith by which we believe in God, he says, "It is not faith of any sort, but that which worketh by love." There are some like things in St. Austin in Exposit. Psalm. 77. and Serm. 6, of the words of our Lord; and Psalm 130, "This is 'to believe in Christ,' viz. to love Him."

Tractat. 29 in Johan. [vol. iii. p. 515.]

§ 16. Thus, at length, I have refuted your long Stricture in as long an answer. From all which, sensible readers may easily judge how false your conclusion is that "faith taken in this sense, (i. e. as simple trust,) is most plainly taught by Christ and His Apostles to be the condition (viz. the one condition) of justification." From what has been said it will also be abundantly clear what empty boastings are in the words with which you end the discussion, as though you were leading a triumph. "You see, then, it is not so hopeless a task to conceive and explain the idea of a reliance or trust in God, (which, forsooth, of itself and before any obedience justifies us)." I should say with more truth: See how vain is the attempt of those who try to explain to us any trust, properly so called, which necessarily carries with it the saving effect of justification.

§ 17. By way of finish I will put some conclusions before the reader, which (in my judgment) clearly and succinctly comprise the true doctrine of Christian faith and trust. *Conclusion first:* Christian faith and trust, properly speak-

ing, differ only as general and particular; so that faith is assent to the whole Gospel, in its utmost extent, while trust is that assent as it regards the promises made in the Gospel. I have proved this conclusion above, which is also of itself sufficiently evident. Trust does not refer to every thing which is delivered in the Gospel, (for we are not properly said to trust in threats or in narrations of past events, &c.,) but to those blessings only which are promised by God in the Gospel. But the faith of the Gospel is exercised in threats and other assertions, either as regards the future, present, or past, even such as in no way concern us, no less than in promises. STRIC. XIII. § 9, 10.

§ 18. *Conclusion second:* Since Christian trust regards the promises of God in the Gospel, and these promises set before us very great and most desirable blessings, to be obtained by man on certain conditions; and consequently it is not possible for any one to give his assent to the Gospel promises, i. e. trust in them, unless he have some proportionable desire of such promised blessings; hence Christian trust (taken in the wider sense of the word trust) is sometimes defined,—Assent to the Gospel promises, joined with the desire of the promised blessings. This definition of 'trust' continually occurs in the writings of the divines who are accustomed to treat theological matters more accurately. Among others see the learned Robert Baron, who treating of the question, "Whether trust is an act of the intellect," &c. says thus: "An act of each kind (viz. both the assent of the intellect and the desire of the will) is required for trust. For no one can be said to trust or be confident of obtaining any blessing, except he have a firm persuasion in the mind, and a desire or love of that blessing in the will." This is excellently explained by Tilenus, saying, that "divine truth is an object of faith, not only as it relates any thing, but especially as it promises any thing: where it is not sufficient to assent to the narration as true, but one must also either embrace or reject the thing offered, which especially belongs to the will." Nevertheless the same learned man[c] holds that trust is formally situated in the intellect. For he subjoins immediately, "The former act is the essence, or formal cause of

Philos. Theol. Anill. Exercit. 3. deFide,&c. Artic. 19. n. 3.

Syntagm. Part i. Disp. 37. Thes. 18.

[c] [i. e. R Baron.]

STRIC. XIII.

trust; the latter is only the act annexed to or accompanying it: and consequently trust is, formally speaking, in the intellect, though it have the desire of the will annexed to it. This assertion is proved, in the first place, because the opposite of trust, viz. distrust, is in the intellect; therefore trust itself is in the intellect. The ground of the premiss is, that distrust, by which a man is said to distrust himself and his affairs, does not signify hatred, or an aversion of the will, but either a doubt as to his own powers, or a persuasion of his own weakness, which without doubt belongs to the intellect. In the second place, because if trust were formally an act of the will, it would be nothing else than a desire or love of the object. But this is contrary to daily experience: for many ardently seek for and desire an object, who have no confidence of obtaining it." We have this granted by that learned man, who in other respects is but too favourable to your hypothesis. But with these things allowed on both sides, let us proceed farther.

§ 19. *Conclusion third:* Each act of trust taken in its wider sense, viz. both assent to the promises of the Gospel, and the desire of the promised blessings, is compatible with the case of a man who has not yet arrived at a state of grace and salvation. This conclusion is proved from the two former. Whoever gives his assent to the whole Gospel, (which I have above shewn, and you yourself allow can be done by a man as yet carnal and unregenerate,) by that act assents or trusts in the promises contained in the Gospel. But from this assent, or trust, necessarily flows a proportionable desire of the promised blessings: as I have shewn in the explanation of the second conclusion. But what need is there of our reasonings? Truth itself teaches that there are many who seek to enter
Lu. 13. 24. τὸ ζητεῖν. the gate of salvation, but will not be able; where the 'seeking' comprises two things at least: 1. a trust or persuasion that eternal salvation has been procured by Christ, and that it is really offered to us in Christ: 2. the desire of obtaining happiness; nay, the word denotes some sort of attempt to obtain it. Yet these seekers will fail in attaining
ἀγωνίζονται. the desired happiness, because they 'strive not,' which word implies a great and constant struggle of mind. They seek
Mat. 6. 33. the kingdom of God, but not as the *first* thing; they are

desirous of immortality, but it is not prized by them enough to make them willing to give up this world's advantages. STRIC. XIII.

§ 20. *Conclusion fourth:* Therefore that trust only in the promises of the Gospel or in Christ the Promiser, places a man, according to the Gospel covenant, in a state of grace and salvation, which has annexed to and joined with it a desire, not of any kind, but a strong and ardent desire, for the very great blessings promised by Christ in the Gospel; a desire which goes beyond all his other desires, and which, being well thought over, and after every thing has been duly weighed, begets in him a determination to do or suffer any thing, so that he may at length obtain the promised blessings. The truth of this conclusion is clearly proved from the former: and is more fully confirmed by remarkable passages of Scripture, worthy of every consideration, Matt. 10. 37, 38, Luke 14. 25—33, inclusive. But this trust, which has annexed to it this strong and ardent desire, is without doubt 'faith perfected by love,' to which St. Paul attributes justification, and Gal. 5. 6. to which no Christian will deny it. Here, then, you have the true doctrine of Christian trust most clearly explained.

STRICTURE XIV.

ON I. DISS. v. p. 28.

In the beginning of this chapter occurs the fourth argument, by which I endeavour to establish St. James's statement concerning the necessity of good works to justification. The chapter begins thus: "Let us take our fourth argument from the manner in which God will judge mankind at the last day. By whatever rule every one shall be judged in the next world by God, according to the same he is justified by Him in this. But in the next world every-one will be judged according to his works, (and not by faith alone). Therefore, in this world every one is justified by God by his works, (and not by faith 'alone'). If I am not very much mistaken, this argument is unanswerable." You meet this argument by a threefold objection. 1st. "I wonder," you say, "that this argument seems to you to be unanswerable, for this is a weakly support of a bad cause. Nothing is more certain, than that Christians are justified by God in this life by faith,

STRIC. XIV.

and are placed in a state of righteousness according to God's appointment, by being made partakers of Christ's satisfaction, 1 Cor. 1. 30, &c.; and that faith alone, without works, is imputed to Abraham and his children for righteousness. But it is not so clear from the parabolic discourses of our Lord as to the last judgment, what will be His proceedings in examining and passing sentence. But we will grant that Christ will render to each of us according to his works; but it by no means follows hence that God will acquit the faithful in His sight from the guilt of sin on account of his works. God does not contradict Himself." 2ndly, you next cavil against my words, 'according to the same' (rule), *eodem plane modo;* you say, "If 'according to the same' (rule), then both in the minor premiss and also in the conclusion the words enclosed in parenthesis ought to be *absque fide,* 'without faith,' and not as is here substituted with a fallacy, *non fide solâ,* 'not by faith alone,' whence it would follow that we are here justified by works alone without faith; which the author himself will not deny is most false. This argument, therefore, is good for nothing, instead of being unanswerable." 3rdly, and lastly, you end the page thus: "Justification is various, according to the variety of the question; if a man is called to trial as to his innocence, whether he be guilty or innocent, the whole world is guilty of sin, and no one is justified by works; he who denies this, makes God a liar. If a man be questioned as to his performance of the Gospel conditions, he must be approved by works. Do you not perceive the variability of the major premiss by reason of the ambiguity of terms?"

Rom. 4. 3, &c.

ANSWER TO STRICTURE XIV.

§ 1. I am not prevented by your Stricture from still affirming confidently that this fourth argument is unanswerable. The major premiss, (if by the words *quomodo* and *eodem modo,* 'by whatever rule, and by the same rule' you understand that a man is justified in this life, and judged or declared just in the world to come on the same conditions, which the sensible and candid reader will at once acknowledge is all that I meant,) is one of plain truth. The minor premiss (if it be taken in the

case of grown up persons, to whom alone any man in his senses will see at once that this controversy has reference) is as certain as any proposition in divinity. However, if the reader has doubts as to either, he will find the proof of either proposition in the fifth chapter of the first Dissertation. What you have said on this head, is really more trifling than I can express.

§ 2. To the first part of your Stricture I answer:—1stly. How we are made partakers of the righteousness and satisfaction of Christ, and by what law and under what condition, I have shewn above fully and satisfactorily. And in what sense St. Paul said that the faith of Abraham was imputed to him without works, I have explained at length, II. Diss. xii. 14—27, (p. 150, &c.) All this, however, when you came to this chapter, you passed over in silence, leaving the margin of my book almost free, and defaced with as few of your remarks as possible; and yet, nevertheless, (such is your candour and sincerity in discussion,) you are perpetually repeating this charge on the subject of Abraham. 2ndly. You prove yourself how great the force of my argument is, (however, to all appearance, you may seem to despise it as good for nothing,) because, to avoid the weight of it, you have found it necessary to call in question an article of the Christian faith of the greatest moment. You say, "It is not so clear from the parabolic discourses of our Lord as to the last judgment, what will be His proceedings in examining and passing sentence." Is it so, indeed? Is it not clear from our Lord's words, Matt. 25, that He will judge every one according to his works? What is there, then, which one may hope can be made clear to you? The discourse, you say, is parabolical: I allow it, and on that account I agree that every thing in that discourse is not (as they say) argumentative. But no divine ever denied that a solid argument could be deduced from the plain drift of the parable. Is it not clearly and expressly asserted, not only in this parable of our Lord, but almost every where in Scripture in plain words, that all men will be judged in the last judgment according to their works? 3rdly. But we are much indebted to you that we have at length your leave to agree with Scripture and the rule of faith, and say that Christ in the world to

STRIC. XIV.

come will judge men according to their works. "We will grant," you say, "that Christ will render to each of us according to his works." Well. What is it, then, my Censurer, that you will not grant us? You say, "But it by no means follows hence that God will acquit the faithful in His sight of the guilt of sin on account of his works." If in the words 'on account of his works,' you mean the meritorious cause, nay, any cause at all properly so called, you must seek some other combatant to defend such an experience: I certainly shrink most fearfully from it, and (God be praised) ever have shrunk from it. What I maintain is, that Christ in the world to come will acquit no one by His merciful sentence of the guilt of sin, and give him the kingdom of heaven, otherwise than on the condition of good works: whence I infer, that no one in this life by the gracious law of Christ acquires a right to the pardon of his sins and eternal salvation, otherwise than on the same condition. In vain will you use all the efforts and engines of your skill to overthrow this conclusion.

§ 3. I go on to the second part of your Stricture. "If according to the same law, then both in the minor premiss and also in the conclusion, the words enclosed in parentheses ought to be *absque fide*, 'without faith,' and not, as is here substituted with a fallacy, ('not by faith alone,') whence it would follow that we are here justified by works alone without faith." Who does not wonder at the sharpness of our Aristarchus? or rather, (to treat a serious matter seriously,) who does not think this grossest heterodoxy of my Censurer deserves censure? He argues thus: If we are justified in this life in the same way in which we shall be judged in the world to come, then we are justified in this life by works alone without faith. The ground of the conclusion is that (according to the opinion of my Censurer) in the world to come we shall be judged by works alone without faith. But who in his senses or what Catholic has taught so before himself? Not one, I am sure! There are some Roman Catholic writers who do not hesitate to assert that "in the last judgment retribution will be given according to works and not according to faith;" but they are carefully refuted by our great Jackson. In truth, faith and works are not to be separated

On the Creed, ii. 30. p. 3588, &c.

in this matter: but rather must we hold that in the last judgment the final acquittal and reward will be adjudged (according to the gracious law of Christ and on account of Him) both to our faith and works, or to our faith which worketh; i. e. (to use St. Paul's expression,) faith perfected by love, or (again to use St. Paul's expression 2 Thess. 1. 8.) obedience done to the Gospel, which both embraces the faith of the Gospel, and all those things which usually do and ought to follow faith. But perhaps you meant by this assertion that all that is done in the last judgment is, that it is shewn and made manifest to the whole world who have embraced Christ and His righteousness with a true faith, and who not: which can be declared by works alone, (since faith is the very thing in question); from which it would follow that it is right to say that men will be judged in the world to come by works alone. If this be your mind and your doctrine, (which I can easily believe,) then you fall into the folly of those who assert that good works are viewed only in the matter of salvation as signs of faith. That doctrine I have already refuted in this same chapter of the Harmony, where it is treated of, by two most powerful arguments: the first argument I borrowed from the famous Gerard Vossius, (whom no one in his senses, no orthodox person ever suspected of heterodoxy on this point,) who concludes from the well-known passages, Matt. 25. 21, 23, 34, 35; Rev. 7. 14, 15; 2 Cor. 4. 17; Gal. 6. 8; Phil. 2. 12, that "they do not say enough, who think that the promise is made to good works, merely as signs of faith: since it is plain from these same passages (to which one might easily add many others) that our works in the matter of salvation are viewed as the indispensable cause or condition precedent, which carries with it inseparably the promise of eternal life." Another weapon I took from the armoury of Hugo Grotius, who proves that good works cannot be viewed in the matter of salvation as mere signs of faith, by this unanswerable argument: "Things which are viewed as signs, are less in themselves than the things signified: but love, which performs these works, and by a sort of figure is implied in these works, is greater than faith, 1 Cor. 13. 13." To these arguments (as usual) you are as silent as a mouse: and what end will there be to discussion,

STRIC. XIV.

δι' ἀγάπης ἐνεργουμένη.

STRIC. XIV.

if an adversary is at liberty still to support his statement from an hypothesis already once refuted and exploded?

§ 4. There remains the third part of your Stricture, "Justification is various according to the variety of the question. If a man is called to trial as to his innocence" &c. Alas for your trifling! Suppose that justification is various: what then? surely the justification of which there can be any question, is one and the same, viz. Gospel justification, or that which is enacted according to the rule of the law and covenant of the Gospel. On this point we ever maintain that a man is constituted righteous in this life and is declared righteous in the world to come on the same conditions, viz. of faith and good works, or love, which by a sort of figure, as I said, is implied in those good works. But as regards your questions, if the question be instituted as to man's innocence, whether he be guilty or innocent, we must at once confess ourselves guilty. No one can be freed from this charge, by which he is convicted of being a sinner in God's sight, either by faith or works, or both together, or in any other way, either in this life or in that which is to come. But our Lord has purchased this for us—that no sinner, solely because he is a sinner and who has not added to all his other sins the additional crime of infidelity or impenitence, should perish for ever: and this grace, which is called the New Covenant, is declared and ratified in the Gospel. This is what St. Paul meant when he proves by many arguments that all men have sinned and are liable to God's wrath and eternal death: consequently that no one can be freed from condemnation otherwise than by and on account of Christ, and according to the gracious covenant established in Christ. This argument of the Apostle I followed out at length II. Diss. c. viii., and have so often openly in the Harmony declared the fact itself, which is supported by this argument, that I am lost in wonder at either your utter shamelessness, or at any rate your most gross neglect in reading my book, since you are continually in your Strictures objecting against me that I teach the contrary. And thus much as to your first question. But now if a man be questioned as to his performance of the conditions of the Gospel, he is made righteous in this life and pronounced righteous in the world to come not by faith alone

but by works also, or by 'faith perfected by love,' since this is the whole condition required in the covenant of the Gospel. And this is all I contend for, and which I have proved by many arguments. You, however, are constantly begging the question, and objecting that a man is merely tested by his works whether or no he has performed the condition of justification required in the Gospel, which is faith alone, as a single virtue. STRIC. XIV.

§ 5. Thus all that you have set forth against my argument does not prevent me from still rightly declaring it to be unanswerable. There are, I allow, some other exceptions which you have adduced on this chapter against my elucidation of this same argument; but these are either off the point, or present the reader with a repetition of what has been already said. One or two of these, however, we will examine. You say that "the method of declaring the righteousness of the faithful in the last judgment, is different from that of constituting him righteous in this life; which can be, and is done really, by faith only; which the Searcher of hearts well knows to be true and living before its fruits are brought forth." I answer, that a man is justified by true and living faith alone, before the bringing forth of fruits, I grant, if you are speaking of the first justification, and by 'living faith' mean (as you ought) 'a faith perfected by love:' and by 'fruits' a series and course of visible works, or that holy life of which I have often spoken: for this faith comprises the internal virtues of repentance, love, &c.: moreover, also, it brings forth some pious words and deeds the moment it is conceived. But what would you infer from hence? Surely this only legitimately: viz. that a man who believes, repents of his sins, loves God, and in God and for God's sake his neighbour, and finally expresses this his inward piety by pious words and deeds, as occasion shall offer, that such a man can attain to the first grace of justification, and so in truth does attain even before that course of visible works. This I have not only openly declared in my Dissertations, but have frequently inculcated on the reader. But how does this affect the major premiss of my argument? Not one whit. For suppose a man who thus believed and repented were immediately, before any fruits of a holy life had been

STRIC. XIV. brought forth, snatched away from this life: I ask whether he in the last judgment will be judged according to his works? Surely no one in his senses will deny it, when it is an universal declaration of Holy Scripture, concerning every adult person, or who is capable of doing moral good or evil, that 'God will render to every one according to his works.' But according to what works will such a man be judged? Assuredly according to those internal works of faith, repentance, love, &c., which he had expressed by corresponding words and deeds, as he had opportunity. According to this more imperfect piety, God in His infinite mercy in Christ Jesus will give him "in the times of refreshing forgiveness of sins, and an inheritance among them that are sanctified," but an inheritance inferior to that which will be assigned to those who have attained a more perfect habit of Christian piety by the continual exercise of good works; and therefore of this man also the major premiss of my argument will be true: viz. that he will be judged by God in the world to come in the same way, i. e. on the same condition, by which he is justified by God in this life.

Ps. 62. 12. Mat. 16. 27. Rom. 2. 6. Rev. 22. 12.

Acts 3.19; 26.18.

Sect. 3. § 6. I had said that when we are justified in this life the right to eternal life is first conferred on us by the law of Christ: but when we are judged in the world to come, the same right is definitely determined to us by the solemn sentence of the judge: which I had laid down as it were the foundation of the major premiss of my argument. To this (after many other things which I have already refuted at length) you answer, "We must know that a right *to* a thing and a right *in* a thing ought to be distinguished. A right to a heavenly inheritance (of which St. Peter speaks 1st Epistle 1. 4.) depends immediately on our adoption through Christ, Rom. 8. 17, of which faith is the conveyer, before that obedience which every son of God performs; but a right in taking the inheritance is adjudged by good works, or by the fruits of charity (which comes under the name of righteousness)." I answer, 1st, The distinction between a right *to* a thing, and a right *in* a thing, as far as it applies to this question, is frivolous, and has no grounds to support it. Whoever by faith 'perfected by love' has a right by the promise of the Gospel *to* a heavenly inheritance, that man,

Gal. 3. 26. Joh. 1. 12.

δικαιοσύνη.

Phil. 1. 11.

if he dies the next moment, must have a right also *in* the kingdom, with no other condition intervening on the part of the man himself. He who would dare to question this, cannot be quite in his senses. But (you will say) if God prolong the life of such a man, a continual and pious course of works and progress in holiness is required from him. Of course, but why is it required? in order that he may obtain any new right? Of course not, it is required in order that he may retain and preserve the right he has obtained[d]. For a right to the kingdom, which is granted to a man in his first justification, is (as we have often said) 'a right depending' on a future condition, to be performed if God shall grant life: consequently a right *revocable*. This is the plain doctrine of Holy Scripture, of the Church Catholic, and so of our own Church. I will add a convincing proof of this. No one is admitted to the grace of the first justification, who has not in vow, at least, and sincere purpose, bound himself to obey God for the future according to the precepts of the Gospel. Now who does not see that the obedience which must in vow be necessarily undertaken to obtain the grace of justification, must no less necessarily be performed in very deed to retain the benefit received, provided God give opportunity? 2ndly, You sadly betray your inconsistency when you affirm that the adoption of sons and a right to a heavenly inheritance is granted to faith alone. For above, when I was proving by many most express testimonies of Scripture, that no one by faith alone, as a single virtue, and without other virtues, was accepted by God unto salvation, and was inferring thence, that no one by faith alone, as a single virtue, is justified, you answered so as not to deny the antecedent, nor to reject the passages of Scripture as falsely adduced by me; but you were content with rejecting the consequent only. Here having waxed bolder, and going on farther, you flatly deny that any thing besides faith is necessary to obtain a right to the kingdom of heaven, or to be accepted by God unto salvation. 3rdly, Your over-confident assertion that a right to a heavenly inheritance is granted to faith alone before any obedience on our part, is most false and dangerous. I entreat

[d] Progress in holiness is besides required for a fuller entrance into Christ's kingdom. See 2 Pet. 1. 8, 11.

STRIC. XIV. you to look at those passages of Scripture, and deign to give some sort of just answer to them. Or if your mind shrinks from this labour, at least answer those passages of Scripture which urge the necessity of repentance, (embracing in its full sense the whole duty of a Christian prescribed in the Gospel covenant,) that we may thereby obtain remission of sins. For from these passages I argue thus conclusively: No one from the promise of the Gospel, by faith alone, and without repentance, has a right to pardon or forgiveness of sins: therefore no one by the Gospel covenant has a right by faith alone and without repentance to a heavenly kingdom. The conclusion is most manifest. For it is something greater to have a right to the kingdom of heaven, than to have a right to pardon or forgiveness of sins; and if these two are to be distinguished, the right to pardon in the natural order of things must come before the right to the kingdom of heaven. The premisses are supported by so many and satisfactory testimonies of Scripture, that no one, who has the Holy Scriptures at heart, will question them. But what need of words? You yourself (as we have seen above) expressly allow that "repentance is required by God for reconciliation with Him." I only ask you this one question, whether any one has a right to salvation before he is reconciled with God? If you affirm this, I shall be astonished how (to use the words of Terence), *tam ineptum quidquam potuerit tibi venire in mentem.*

§ 7. Thus at length, after a careful review, I have vindicated my first Dissertation from your objections. For your remarks on the sixth chapter are so frivolous and utterly unimportant (I solemnly declare that I write this as the truth from my heart) that I cannot delay the reader with them. I was also afraid of this examination growing to a too great and unnecessary bulk. Your notes on my latter Dissertation will be more easily despatched, for you have so ordered your Strictures, (either by accident or design,) that your censures on my first Dissertation have been more lengthy than in the latter: moreover you have treated of some things there, which more properly belong to the latter Dissertation. But I shall be scrupulous in not passing by any thing which you have censured, and which I have not yet refuted, that seems with any appearance of reason to impugn my method of reconciling the Apostles.

STRICTURE XV.

ON II. DISS. iii. 4. p. *55, 56.*

Here, after rejecting three ways of reconciling St. James with St. Paul, in the last place I weigh the opinion of the learned Joshua Placæus on the best means of reconciling the apparent contradiction. My words are: "The last opinion which now remains, is that which, I find, greatly pleased that learned man Placæus, and I am not sure whether it be not peculiar to him. He thus explains it: 'Justification is opposed to accusation: two charges are laid against us at the judgment. First, it is objected that we are sinners, i. e. have violated the covenant of the law: secondly, that we are unbelievers, i. e. have not performed the condition of the covenant of grace, viz. faith. From the first accusation we are justified by faith alone, through which we embrace the grace and righteousness of Christ; from the latter, by works, which are the proofs of faith. St. James regarding the latter accusation, properly asserts that man is justified by works and not by faith alone: but St. Paul regarding the first, contends that man is justified by faith only.'—Thus far he. But not to speak of other mistakes in this opinion, the learned man is mistaken in his whole system. For he first asserts that faith is the whole and only condition of the Gospel covenant, and that works are only to be regarded as signs and proofs of faith, all which has been already proved erroneous: and secondly, that works are admitted by St. James as necessary to the latter justification, and faith as sufficient by St. Paul to the first, both of which we have seen are far from the truth, and with respect to St. Paul shall soon particularly prove it." To all this you answer thus at length. "What this excellent man (whose statements I have never yet met with) proposes for the reconcilement of the Apostles, quite agrees with what my father of blessed memory held, of whom I entreat you to allow me to say a few words. T. G.[e] of London, (whose name without mention of mine is sufficiently well known,) A.D. 1617, undertook to explain in Sermons the Epistle of St. James, which by God's grace he performed with systematic accuracy.

STRIC. XV.

[e] Thomas Gataker.

STRIC. XV. At length, A.D. 1640, when fierce contentions were rife on the point of justification in the city churches, being a man no less desirous of peace than truth, he endeavoured with a calm and settled mind, yet with severe reasoning to set forth the truth, which had been well-nigh lost in altercation, and certainly obscured by the clouds of passion; and thus to put an end to dispute. For his text, as the ground of his manifold Dissertation, he chose the passage of St. Paul, Rom. 3. 28. The notes of these Sermons, or the imperfect and rude outlines, I have now in my possession. Would that he had been able to put his last hand to them. A little while before his death he gathered together his scattered papers, and began to recast his discourses. But overtaken by disease, and soon hurried away by death, he laid aside his work with his life (within a few weeks of being an octogenarian). He pursued one course in the exposition of both Apostles. After rejecting (not without assigning his reason for rejection) various elaborations of various persons, which were either unsound or inapposite, he took his stand by the opinion which I see Placæus adopted. This I will briefly insert from his notes, from which I shall not be ashamed to learn wisdom. He allows that both Apostles, in putting forward the justification of Abraham, meant the same faith, viz. real living and saving faith; that we must not suppose different kinds of justification meant, but that this justification is a deliverance or acquittal from a charge brought against us, or from the imputation of fault. He also did not suppose it necessary to imagine different courts, in which God pleads with Christians. That the two Apostles both spoke of the same works he proved from the example of Abraham, which St. Paul produces to include his works from justification, and St. James to shew that they availed to justification. At length, however, he distinguishes the point in question, and observes that the state of the question is different in the two Apostles. In St. Paul the state of the question or point of dispute is as to a person's guilt, from sin in general: (suppose of Abraham, the father and pattern of the faithful:) 1. Whether by the law of God he is amenable to Divine Justice? and 'since no flesh is just before God,' whether and how he can be justified? St. Paul avows that a man manifestly guilty, cannot be

otherwise freed from the charge laid against him, and cleared from aspersion of the fault, i. e. be justified, but through the obedience and blood of Christ, and faith in His blood, which makes the righteousness of our Sponsor our own: but that the best works cannot be alleged for the obtaining of righteousness, nor avail to do away the punishment of sin. But in the other, the state of the question is as to a man who is accused of any particular sin, whether it be perfidy towards man or hypocrisy before God. Now a man can defend his integrity, even in God's sight, (if he be not conscious of any deceit,) and prove and defend his innocence, by his works; and he will be justified by works. Thus in St. James this is the case with Abraham, the sincerity of whose virtues was thus proved before God." After explaining your father's opinion, brimful of self-confidence, you say somewhat arrogantly, "you despise the best method of reconciling the Apostles, because you do not understand it." STRIC. XV.

ANSWER TO STRICTURE XV.

§ 1. Placæus' opinion, which I now see was not peculiar to him, but held in common with your father, I thought I had refuted sufficiently, though briefly, in the place on which this Stricture is inflicted. I say that this opinion is false both in statement and assumption. As regards the statement, the learned man plainly held that faith is the whole and entire condition of the Gospel covenant, and that works are considered only as the signs and arguments of faith: that this is most false I have proved both in the Harmony and Examen by many unanswerable reasons and arguments. As regards the assumption, Placæus holds that St. Paul treats of works as though they were necessary to justification: (viz. that by which we are freed from the charge brought against us of being unbelievers, and not having fulfilled the condition of the covenant of grace:) that faith is admitted by St. James as sufficient for our justification from the charge brought against us, that we are guilty of having violated the condition laid down in the covenant of the law: both which statements are untrue. For the works of which St. Paul is treating, are excluded by him from any part in our justification. For

STRIC. XV. St. Paul is not treating of works proceeding from faith, and by which, as arguments and proofs, our faith may be proved: but of the 'works of the law,' i. e. of works either ritual, or others which have nothing in common with the faith and grace of the Gospel. Hence he expressly opposes the law against which he argues, to the law of faith, Rom. 3. 27. I say also that the faith of which St. James treats, is not admitted by him as sufficient for our primary justification (by which forsooth we are freed from the charge that is brought against us of having violated the condition laid down in the covenant of the law). For he rejects faith by itself altogether, as vain and thoroughly useless. But this faith would not be vain and useless if it were sufficient for our primary justification. On these grounds I affirmed that Placæus' opinion contributed nothing to the solution of our difficulty. But in spite of all these things, (according to your custom of sticking pertinaciously to your conclusion in spite of all arguments,) you affirm that I have despised the best method of reconciling the Apostles because I did not understand it.

§ 2. Well, then, let us examine more accurately this best means of reconcilement explained by Placæus briefly and succinctly, which you have drawn out more at length from your father's notes, though not a bit more clearly; and here again we will consider your opinion as to a man's accusation and the justification opposite thereto in God's sight, first in statement and apart from the present question, next in assumption, and as far as it is applied by you to reconcile St. Paul and St. James together. As regards the statement, first it must be noted that the various causes and questions in the matter of man's justification (of which you speak) are not explained by you accurately and distinctly enough. A right line is a rule both for itself and an oblique one, and therefore I will briefly set before the reader the real truth: and when this is known and understood, it will be very easy to discern the error and fallacy of your explanation. When we speak of the justification or accusation of a man in God's sight, three questions may be instituted. The first question is, whether a man is a sinner, and liable to eternal death on account of his sins? Here no one can defend himself before

God 'as not guilty,' as St. Paul constantly teaches. 2ndly. It may be asked, whether a sinner must 'necessarily' be condemned and punished with eternal death? We answer, by no means—Here the satisfaction of our Lord Jesus Christ comes to our succour, by which it has been effected not only that God can with justice, but that He also will deliver a sinner from death, and give him life and eternal salvation, under certain conditions to be performed by man through the grace of God. 3rdly. Lastly, a third question may be asked, viz. whether a sinner has performed the conditions on which by the will both of God the Father and Christ Himself, the saving fruit and effect of Christ's satisfaction depends: and consequently, whether according to the covenant entered into between the Son giving and the Father receiving satisfaction, (the 'handwriting' of which we have in the covenant of the Gospel,) he is to be delivered from death, and granted eternal life, i. e. be justified? The man who does not here see that the saving fruit of Christ's satisfaction does not depend on faith alone, as a single virtue, must be enveloped in worse than Cimmerian darkness. For it is perfectly clear from innumerable passages of Scripture, (which I have shewn over and over again,) that the forgiveness of sins (which is the chief fruit and effect of Christ's satisfaction, and draws every thing else with it) depends on the condition not only of faith but also (and that especially) of repentance. What need of words? The Holy Spirit expressly teaches that the Son of God 'perfected by sufferings, has become the author of eternal salvation to all them that obey Him,' i. e. for all those and those only, has He by His death obtained justification and salvation. Therefore, if a man is accused of not having performed the condition on which the saving fruit and effect of Christ's satisfaction by the will of God and Christ revealed in the Gospel depends, it is evident that he cannot be freed from that accusation by faith alone. Somewhat else must be adduced by him for his justification.

STRIC. XV.

Heb. 2. 10; 5. 8, 9.

§ 3. He who keeps this in mind will easily see, 1st, that you are wrong in teaching that a man is justified from the first accusation, by which he is charged with being a sinner, and guilty of having violated the condition laid down in the covenant of the law. For from this charge no man can be

STRIC. XV. justified by any means; it will for ever stand that man has sinned, and violated the condition of the covenant of the law. The satisfaction of Christ is not a payment of that very thing which was due; for that was the personal (as they say) punishment of the delinquent; the law therefore, through Christ's satisfaction, is not put into execution. 2ndly, It will be seen clearly that you have not placed faith in its proper place and order. For you join it as it were with the righteousness and satisfaction of Jesus Christ for this end, viz. that a man may be justified from that first accusation, which charges him with being a sinner and guilty of having violated the condition laid down in the covenant of the Gospel. Thus Placæus: "From the first accusation we are justified by faith alone, through which we embrace the grace and righteousness of Christ." In like manner you also affirm that "a man is freed from the charge urged against him through the obedience or the blood of Christ, and through faith in Christ's blood, which makes the righteousness of our Sponsor our own." N.B. by "the obedience of Christ and our faith." Thus you ascribe a sort of legal justification to faith; but the secret of the thing lies in this; you think that by faith, as by an instrument, the righteousness and satisfaction of Christ is made really our own, by which we ourselves are constituted perfectly righteous, even according to the rigour of the law. But here you are involved in a threefold error. For, 1st, the righteousness of Christ is not made really ours: 2ndly, if it were made ours, it could not be made ours through faith: 3rdly, much less can faith effect by way of an instrument, that the righteousness of Christ should be made really ours; each of which we have fully proved above. What follows? Faith, then, at length obtains its proper place, when it is adduced for our justification from that last accusation, by which we are charged with not having performed the condition of the covenant of grace. But from this accusation faith justifies a man in part only, i. e. faith is a part indeed of the condition, but not the whole and entire condition, on which according to the covenant of the Gospel our justification or the forgiveness of our sins by the blood of Christ depends.

§ 4. The next thing that I propose to the reader's observ-

ation is this: that according to your opinion there is a sort of justification of a man, 'and that in God's sight,' from hypocrisy, or from the charge of not having performed the condition required in the Gospel covenant, viz. faith by means of signs and proofs, i. e. good works. I say, that this justification is made out by you not only unnecessarily but absurdly. For God sees by immediate intuition, (so to speak,) and sees through thoroughly both our faith and its sincerity. He has no need of signs, proofs, or other tests, to be able to judge with certainty of it. I pass from the doctrine to the assumption. STRIC. XV.

§ 5. Surely the opinion which is so false and absurd in doctrine, will not be true in assumption, and cannot be used to reconcile the two Apostles except as an ingenious device. Nevertheless, that the truth may be seen more clearly, I will shew briefly that this method of reconcilement which you call the best is thoroughly futile. There is no question of what justification St. Paul is speaking; the whole difference and dispute is, what sort of justification is meant in St. James's discourse chap. 2. And here you yourself allow that the justification of which St. James speaks is that which passes before God's tribunal: but you will have that justification to be no other than that by which the sincerity of our faith is proved before God by works, or by which we are freed at God's tribunal from the charge of not having performed the condition of the Gospel, viz. faith. I say that this interpretation does not at all square with St. James's discourse. For, 1st, the Apostle plainly enough attributes justification of the same kind both to works and faith, and yokes faith and works together as a pair drawing the same justification along with them. The words are express: "Ye see that by works a man is justified and not by faith only;" whence it is clear that although not by faith only, yet by faith also and not by works alone a man is justified by that justification of which the Apostle speaks. But another justification cannot be attributed to faith than that by which a man is freed on account of Christ from eternal condemnation, and is accepted unto salvation: therefore of this justification alone St. James must be understood in each part of the proposition. Whichever way you turn, you can- Jas. 2. 24.

STRIC. XV. not avoid the force of this argument. 2ndly, This interpretation blots the Apostle's argument with a most gross solecism. For if St. James is speaking of that justification by which the sincerity of our faith is proved before God, then his conclusion "You see that by works a man is justified, and not by faith only," must be explained thus; 'You see that by works the sincerity of a man's faith is proved before God, and not by faith only.' Who in his senses would not be indignant at so unmeaning a sense being fixed upon that most wise Apostle? 3rdly, To this interpretation are plainly opposed the words, ver. 14, "What shall it profit, my brethren, if a man say he have faith and have not works? will faith save him?" For hence it is as clear as possible that the Apostle is speaking of that accusation, not by which we are freed from the charge of hypocrisy, (as you say and think,) but by which we are delivered from eternal damnation, and acquire a right to salvation: and according to the Apostle, faith is in need of works, (i. e. of love, which produces all good works,) not only that its sincerity may be proved before God, but also that it may be of avail to a man's salvation. These arguments I had used II. Diss. i. 7. p. 15, to destroy the hypothesis of those who understand the justification of St. James to be a declaration of righteousness before men. You see how they serve equally to overthrow entirely your system of reconcilement (which you are almost swallowed up with) as well as all your arguments that follow in the same place.

§ 6. Now let your very best method of reconcilement be compared with this, which is drawn out at length in the latter Dissertation, but which I will here summarily set before you, leaving the reader to decide freely which is to be preferred. With you I allow that the state of the question in the two Apostles is quite different, but I contend that this difference is to be explained far otherwise than is done by you. St. Paul in his discussions had to deal with adversaries who were not all of the same kind. At one time he disputes against the professed enemies of the Gospel, viz. both the Gentiles, and most especially the Jews, who were strangers to the faith in Christ, the former of whom trusted in the law of nature, the latter in the schooling of their law, while both

despised the Gospel of Christ. Against these the Apostle shews by more arguments than one that neither of their laws is sufficient to justify a sinner and lead him to salvation; that the Gospel of Christ alone could do this: for the proof of this assertion he brings forward mainly two great arguments. 1. That, whereas all men are sinners, and are liable to God's wrath on account of their sins, by neither of these laws is there any certain way shewn of obtaining forgiveness. As to the law of nature, it is plain, since it is destitute of all Divine promise: whence the Gentiles are said by the Apostle to be "strangers from the covenants of promise, having no hope." As regards the law of Moses delivered on Mount Sinai, the Apostle shews that by that law, if it be viewed carnally and according to the letter, (under which consideration alone he denies justification to it; since spiritually understood it was nothing else than the Gospel itself shadowed out in types,) a remission indeed is promised, but that neither full nor perfect, i. e. neither remission of all sins, nor remission of any sin which frees a man from internal guilt and is joined with the gift of eternal life: on the other hand, in the Gospel, that the true and only 'propitiation' is openly displayed and set forth by God before men, viz. His Son Jesus Christ, who by the shedding of His blood, most precious in the sight of God, hath obtained real remission of sins for all who truly repent; and so in the Gospel not a temporal only, but 'eternal redemption and salvation,' (Heb. 5. 9, and 9. 12). The most full and perfect remission of all sins, even the most grievous, joined with the gift of eternal life, is promised to all who by faith in Christ heartily repent of those sins, and devote themselves for the future to God and a holy life. 2. Another argument of the Apostle is of this kind,—that since all men are by nature weak and wholly powerless, and cannot by their native strength break off the dominion of sin, much less perform true holiness and righteousness acceptable to God unto salvation: and since it is repugnant to Divine Justice and Holiness to forgive any one his sins and confer on him eternal life who is not purged from vices, nay who is not partaker in some degree of "the Divine nature;" there is need of the most effectual grace of God in this matter, which is administered through the

STRIC. XV.

Eph. 2. 12.

STRIC. XV. Gospel of Christ alone, "the ministery of the spirit, the law of the spirit of life, the power of God unto salvation." This I have explained at length in my latter Dissertation. Now here the true and genuine state of the question is clearly seen, viz. "whether a sinner ('an enemy towards God, and weak,' Rom. 5. 6, 10.) can be justified and brought to salvation by any other means than those shewn and prescribed in the Gospel of Christ?" In truth, the Apostle is not treating precisely of this or that particular benefit, as regards our salvation, (as some have fancied,) but of the whole and entire economy of human salvation, which he denies can be procured by any other means than those revealed in the Gospel. This means he calls 'faith,' for the very weighty reasons we have so often mentioned. But he who can persuade himself that St. Paul in so laborious a discussion was trying to shew that by faith alone, as a single virtue, and distinct from all other Gospel virtues, and not even by any act of faith, but that peculiar act which is called 'reliance;' by faith 'which is' alive, but not 'as it is' alive; lastly, by faith, as by an instrument, laying hold of the righteousness of Christ and making it really ours, that thus a man is justified: what will not such a man dream? surely these vain subtilties and refinements of words, as they by no means agreed with the spirit of that most wise and divinely inspired Apostle, so had they been most remote from his aim and purpose. Such a harvest of subtilties was neither sown nor reaped by the opponents with whom St. Paul disputed: inasmuch as they rejected the whole way of obtaining salvation prescribed in the Gospel.

§ 7. Besides these there were also other opponents, whom St. Paul (and that especially) opposed, viz. the Judaizing Christians, who joined the ceremonies of the Mosaic law, as though they were necessary to be observed for salvation, with the faith of Christ or the Gospel. Against this the Apostle inveighs both in the Epistle to the Romans and also especially in his Epistle to the Galatians. Against these he builds this conclusion: "In Christ Jesus neither circumcision availeth any thing, nor uncircumcision, but faith perfected by love," Gal. 5. 6; with which another passage must be compared, Gal. 6. 15, "In Christ Jesus neither circumcision availeth

any thing, nor uncircumcision, but a new creature;" in Christ Jesus, i. e. according to the law of Christ or the Gospel, circumcision and all the other Mosaic rites avail nothing to justification and salvation: the entire and only condition for man's justification and salvation required in the Gospel covenant is 'faith perfected by love' or 'a new creature.' Here the Apostle fully expresses the condition of the Gospel covenant. Here also the state of the question is plain, viz. "whether the means of obtaining salvation prescribed in the Gospel is sufficient of itself and without the observance of the Mosaic rites?" As often then as St. Paul opposing these adversaries (which is generally the case) affirms that a man is justified by faith without the works of the law, it is most evident that faith is opposed by him not to the other virtues of the Gospel, but to the Mosaic rites: consequently that it is put by metonymy or synecdoche for that universal spiritual righteousness prescribed in the Gospel, and opposed to the carnal ceremonies of the old law. But if metonymy or synecdoche must here necessarily be admitted, what is there that should make us unwilling to believe that the Apostle has used the same figure elsewhere? Thus you have the state of the question with St. Paul (unless I am greatly deceived) clearly explained. STRIC. XV.

§ 8. As regards St. James, the opponents with whom he is engaged (as I have often remarked) are those outrageous Antinomians, the followers of Simon, who interpreted St. Paul's doctrine falsely, and perverting it to their own and others' destruction, taught that faith alone is sufficient for man's justification without that love which produces good works. To the pestilent doctrine of these men, the Apostle opposes as it were its own antithesis, viz. that 'by works a man is justified, and not by faith only.' But he speaks plainly of works not (as St. Paul) opposed to faith, but proceeding from faith co-operating with and perfecting it, ch. 2. ver. 22; and therefore, here the state of the question is unquestionably this: "Whether, according to the Gospel covenant, faith alone, as a single virtue, is sufficient, without other virtues and good works, to a man's justification?" The Simonists affirmed it, abusing the authority of St. Paul, to support their own hypothesis. But the side of the question which denies

STRIC. XV. it (which is ours) is avowedly taken by St. James, who best knew both the truth of the Gospel and St. Paul's meaning.

STRICTURE XVI.

ON II. DISS. iv. 4. p. 57.

Here, before laying down the principles of that method by which I considered St. James should be reconciled with St. Paul, I explained my opinion in the following words: "First, then, we must enquire what St. Paul means by the word 'faith.' The answer which we have before given in brief to this question, we shall here more largely explain and demonstrate. Faith, then, to which justification is attributed by St. Paul, is not to be understood as one single virtue, but denotes the whole condition of the Gospel covenant, that is, comprehends in one word all the works of Christian piety: for Zegerus rightly observes; 'Absolute and perfect faith, of which most frequent mention is made in Scripture, is that by which we not only believe there is a God, but also by believing in Him with truly pious affections we approach to God, and feel ourselves dependent on Him. And this word unites in its meaning hope, charity, and good works:' and he adds; 'It ought, therefore, to be observed that wherever St. Paul and the other sacred writers attribute justification, salvation, life, and the like, to faith, they speak of a faith lively and perfect,' that is, one which includes hope, charity, and good works." To this you answer: "Zegerus's words are absurd; the principle too which you lay down is most false. I will use only one argument: St. Paul makes justification on our part depend on one thing alone, faith in the blood of Christ without works. Will any one in his senses suppose that when St. Paul says that a man is justified by faith without works, he means, by faith with works? And he is speaking of works which the moral law, confirmed by the Gospel, demands, and which Abraham did as well from fear as from love of God. These are the very works which St. Paul, in words clearer than the light, separates from the justification of a sinner by the grace of God and righteousness of Christ. And this 'faith in the blood' of

Christ, (Rom. 3. 25,) on which our justification in God's sight depends, is (not as he in Plutarch said) a swarm of virtues, but one single virtue, which as the Apostle most clearly sets forth, is in a peculiar manner exercised on one object. Habits, you know, take their oneness from their objects [f]. The object of justifying faith is the blood of Christ: not the truth of the word which is the object of credence, but the obedience of Christ which is the object of confidence."

STRIC. XVI. σμῆνος ἀρετῶν.

ANSWER TO STRICTURE XVI.

§ 1. This is the old story. They talk most absurdly, whoever they are that say a word out of tune with your absurdities. However, I have most clearly proved the point in which you say Zegerus is most absurd. Why do you not answer those arguments? Surely because you are not able, nor ever will be. For they are so conclusive, that by their value I would willingly let any sensible and unprejudiced person judge of and so put an end to the whole of the controversy which exists between us. Now to prove your censure, (which by the way is no proof of good judgment, but of the greatest rashness,) you say you will use only one argument. And yet this one is either made up of many, or it is no argument at all. But come, let us examine your words singly, and see where this one argument lies concealed.

§ 2. First, you say "St. Paul makes justification on our part depend on one thing alone, faith in the blood of Christ without works." But this is no argument but mere begging the question, your usual way of reasoning: for when I prove in many ways that faith, as a single virtue, is not the only thing on our part on which justification depends, you invariably answer me by denying the conclusion, not paying the slightest regard to the premises, unworthy I conclude of the consideration of such a strenuous disputer. You say the Apostle makes faith the only thing on which justification on our part depends. This you inculcate and repeat a hundred times: as if you intended at any rate to crush your opponent

[f] Vid. S. Th. Aquin. Prim. 11dæ. 9. 1. ant. 3. 9. 18. ant. 2. and 9. 54. ant. 2.

STRIC. XVI. by repetition whom you cannot refute by argument. You appear to be nailed to this hypothesis as Prometheus was to the rock. And so you are not ashamed to say openly somewhere in your remarks that you will deny even to death my opinion, namely that 'faith is used in this argument by St. Paul metonymically or synecdochially.' But, I pray, Sir, if you are determined to grow old and so die in your folly where will there be any remedy?

"To save a man that is unwilling
Is really just as bad as killing[g]."

§ 3. But I will go on following you step by step. Perhaps your one argument is hid under these words: "Will any one in his senses suppose that when St. Paul says a man is justified by faith without works, he means, by faith with works?" Arguing forsooth from an absurdity. But you have charged me with this absurdity at your own pleasure, by explaining my words too baldly. What I maintain is this: that when St. Paul says "a man is justified by faith without works," he means, a man is justified by the faith of the Gospel with obedience proceeding from the same, without the works of the law, which St. Paul himself continually declares. And so I affirm that St. James in teaching that "a man is justified by works, not by faith only," does not in any way contradict St. Paul: because St. James means works proceeding from faith, or works which St. Paul includes in the word faith, and not works of the law, which he excludes. What is there absurd in all this? Though you strain every nerve of your ingenuity you will never find a better way of explaining this contradiction.

§ 4. You go on: "St. Paul is speaking of works which the moral law confirmed by the Gospel demands." I answer: I never denied that even the works of the moral law were excluded by St. Paul in a certain sense from justification, but have avowedly maintained and supported this by several clear passages from St. Paul, II. Diss. vii. 2. p. 77. So that it is plain from this, how very inattentively, or which is worse, with what bad feeling you must have read my book, when you so confidently charge me with the contrary opinion.

[g] Hor., Ars Poet. 467.

I added this in the same place. "The works of the moral law are not excluded from justification by St. Paul, simply as such, but only so far as they are required in the Mosaic covenant, and are part of the condition annexed to that covenant; in a word, so far only as they may be considered separate from evangelical grace." I explain this in the same Dissertation as follows. 1. St. Paul excludes wholly and entirely those works of the moral law which a man might do by the help of the law alone, that is, by his own strength, without the all-efficacious grace of Christ, which the law, as far as it is viewed by St. Paul, never held out. Since such works as these, whatever they are, conduce in no way towards true righteousness, and have no supernatural goodness in them. 2. St. Paul excludes all works whatever, even of the moral law, although rightly done, and endued with supernatural goodness, thus far, in that he maintains that no one under the Mosaic covenant could obtain true justification by them, because it proposes no true justification, that is, such as is united with the gift of eternal life. I add, that this great blessing comes from the covenant of grace alone, confirmed by the blood of the Mediator. By which words I mean, that our best works deserve nothing of God, and are by themselves of no efficacy towards justification or salvation, without the intervention of the propitiatory sacrifice of our Saviour. I said the same in recapitulating the Apostle's argument (II. Diss. xviii. 2. p. 194.) "St. Paul rejects from justification the following descriptions of works: 1st, Ritual works prescribed by the ceremonial law. 2ndly, Moral works performed by the natural powers of man, in a state either of the law or mere nature, before and without the grace of the Gospel. 3rdly, Jewish works, or that trifling righteousness inculcated by the Jewish masters. 4thly, and lastly, all works separate from Christ the Mediator, which would obtain eternal salvation by their own power, or without reference to the covenant of grace established by the blood of Christ." Who in his senses can deny that there is here a full enumeration of those works which St. Paul excludes from justification? Nevertheless, as you compel me, I will endeavour to explain the whole matter more clearly, if indeed that is possible. St. Paul in treating of the causes of our justification, is

STRIC. XVI.

STRIC. XVI.

sine qua non.

speaking (to say nothing of the primary cause which all acknowledge is in the great mercy of God) either, 1st, of the initiative and meritorious cause, or, 2ndly, of the indispensable cause or condition required on our part. With regard to the meritorious cause St. Paul excludes all works of men of every kind, and likewise faith itself, attributing such a causality in the work of justification solely to the propitiatory sacrifice of our Lord Jesus Christ. Hence we are said by St. Paul, (Rom. 3. 24,) to be "justified freely by His grace, through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus;" and Rom. 5. 9, "being justified in His blood," and in the nineteenth verse, "made righteous by His obedience." This I profess before God with all my heart against Socinus and his followers, whose plainly heretical dogmas, utterly opposed to the consent of the Catholic Church, no one living can abhor more than myself; and it should be matter of shame and regret to yourself and others like you, that you have aspersed me with this taint of Socinianism, which nothing can ever wash away: and with equal sincerity I protest against those Roman Catholics (with whom you somewhere class me) who, while they confess that Jesus Christ has merited all things for us by His own obedience, do not hesitate from some madness that has seized them, to attribute merit properly so called, or as they say merit of condignity, to our works taken by themselves, and without reference to the most gracious covenant of the Gospel: which opinion even the Socinians abhor. With regard to the *causa sine qua non,* or indispensable condition required on our part, St. Paul declares that a man "is justified by faith without the works of the law." Here I confidently affirm (which also I have proved by most unexceptionable arguments) that St. Paul does not oppose faith to other evangelical virtues, which proceed from it, and are wont to follow it, but only (as he expresses it) to works of the law. For who can suppose that the Apostle meant by works of the law evangelical works, that is, those which flow from faith and the grace of the Gospel, and are done according to its command? especially when it is quite plain that in this argument the law is always contradistinguished from and so opposed to the Gospel. I must again tell my reader that I have refuted

statedly at length the objection which you add concerning the works of Abraham, (II. Diss. xii. p. 150).

§ 5. But perhaps this one argument of yours is yet to be sought for, viz. in that famous passage Rom. 3. 25, where mention is made of "faith in the blood of Christ:" for you appear to have thought that St. Paul intended in that passage a certain special faith, which has in itself a justifying power, or which necessarily involves justification: that my conjecture is not altogether groundless, may appear from this, that from this passage you yourself presently conclude that the special object of 'justifying' faith, as such, is the blood of Christ; and your father also, whose notes you borrow, does the same. For in his second epistle to Baxter, I read these words: "That form of speaking, 'faith or confidence in the blood of Christ,' seems to hint that this virtue, beyond all others, has a more special relation to the satisfaction made to the justice of God for our sins, by the sufferings of Christ, which alone can be alleged by us before the judgment seat of God for our absolution from those sins." Here I will apply with truth your own words: "one-eyed people see many things which do not exist." Both you and your father (begging your pardon) have thoroughly misunderstood the whole passage: it runs: "Whom God hath set forth to be a propitiation through faith in His blood:" where if a close attention is given to the passage, it will be seen that the words "in His blood" are not to be referred to 'faith' but to 'propitiation,' so that the verse does not declare the special object of faith, but the method of propitiation made by Christ, thus: "Whom God hath set forth to be a propitiation by His blood through faith." The reasons for this interpretation are as follow: 1st. The very construction of the words is repugnant to your interpretation: if the Apostle had meant what you fancy, he would have said διὰ τῆς πίστεως τῆς εἰς τὸ αὐτοῦ αἷμα, "through faith which is in His blood." Now in the first place, the article τῆς before the preposition is wanting, and secondly, the preposition is not εἰς, but ἐν. Besides, (as Paræus has observed from Beza,) in all the MSS. the pronoun αὐτοῦ is read with the aspirate and not the soft breathing, so that it answers to ἑαύτου, and shews that the words ἐν αἵματι αὐτοῦ, 'in His own blood,' must necessarily be

STRIC. XVI.

joined with ἱλαστήριον. Who does not see the solecism in these words 'by faith in His own blood?' Piscator, who was well versed in the Greek language, saw that your interpretation laboured under these difficulties, and yet (which is to be wondered at) gave his approval to it. For in his scholia on the passage διὰ τῆς πιστεως ἐν τῷ αἵματι αὐτοῦ, he says: "I certainly think that αὐτοῦ must be read instead of αὑτοῦ: and that there is an ellipse of the article τῆς before the preposition ἐν, which must be supplied from the preceding words, and therefore ἐν is put for εἰς: lastly, the comma after the word 'faith' must be struck out. It will be clearer if you say *per fidem in sanguine Ipsius*, 'by faith in His blood.'" But what is this but wresting the sacred text to support our own preconceived notions? 2ndly. The phrase 'faith in blood,' if you attend to the meaning, is harsh and uncommon. The blood of Christ is never either by St. Paul or the other sacred writers connected with our faith as its special object, but always with words which signify the propitiation, reconciliation, or redemption which Christ has made for us: and that too so as to declare the method of such propitiation, reconciliation, or redemption. This must be evident to any one who has paid the least attention to Holy Scripture; see for instance, Eph. 1. 7; Col. 1. 14; Heb. 9. 12, 13, 14, 18—22. 3rdly. In the last place, the words διὰ τῆς πίστεως are not in the excellent Alexandrian manuscript: and St. Chrysostom does not read them. But what need is there of many words in so clear a case? If I were a Sociniau, I would most willingly accept and embrace with open arms your version of the passage, since it agrees most excellently with the teaching of Socinus. For he explains at length and in a way wonderfully at variance with the words and intent of Holy Scripture, all those passages in which a connection of the blood or the death of Christ with the remission of sins obtained for us, is expressed. He is especially fond of one of these explanations above all other, and so he continually inculcates this, as if it were the very foundation of his cause. It is this, that the death of Christ persuades us to the very thing which is required for the remission of our sins, that is, faith, or as Socinus would say, the hope of obtaining everlasting life. Now what can agree better with this explana-

tion than your version of the passage, which would refer the words "in His blood" not to the propitiation made for us by Christ but to our faith? See now how true is what I say; Grotius in his posthumous annotations (in which I grieve to say he too much delights in Socinian interpretations), thus interprets the passage: "The word ἱλαστήριον, כפרת in the Old Testament, meant the cover of the ark, upon which a cloud from God used to rest, which assured the people of God's favour toward them: see Lev. 16. 2; Num. 7. 89. So also God by ratifying the prayers of Christ, and for their sake sending the Spirit upon the Apostles, (John 14. 16,) shewed His good will towards mankind: but when He adds, 'by faith,' He shews the way in which a man may obtain the effect of that good will, that is, true righteousness, namely, 'by having faith in the blood of Christ,' i. e. in the doctrine ratified by the blood of Christ in the same way as treaties were wont to be ratified by blood." STRIC. XVI.

I have dwelt longer on this discussion not because your objection was of so great weight, but because I thought it worth while to give the true explanation of this much contested passage of the Apostle. For supposing we were to grant that the Apostle had used this harsh phrase, which is found no where else in Scripture, 'faith in blood,' what would your cause gain by it? not one jot. For then faith in blood would be nothing else but that faith by which we believe that Christ poured out His own blood for the expiation of our sins, and at the same time have confidence that God the Father will for the sake of the outpouring of His Son's blood be propitious to us if we repent. Now it is quite clear that this faith cannot attain the effect of justification, unless it bring forth a true and fruitful repentance.

§ 6. I agree in what you say about faith not being a swarm of virtues but a single virtue. For faith, as I have already observed (I. Diss. iv. 5. p. 24), both in St. Paul's Epistles and the other Scriptures of the New Testament, when viewed by itself, is nothing more than the same kind of assent as that by which we believe in the sufferings, death, and resurrection of Christ for us, and that consequently all things are true which He has delivered to us in the name of God, either by promises or commands: this I have proved

STRIC. XVI.

by many passages, (see especially Rom. 4. 20, 21, 24; Heb. 11. 1; 1 John 5. 4, 5; John 8. 24). But notwithstanding this, I say (which I have also supported by the strongest proofs) that St. Paul when he attributes justification to faith, does not consider it as a single virtue, but as a swarm of virtues, *σμῆνος ἀρετῶν*, and surrounded as it were by the whole concourse of evangelical virtues, that is, faith perfected by love, *ἐνεργουμένην δι' ἀγάπης*, which is the mother of all other virtues. This is plain even from those passages of Holy Scripture in which the Apostle describes the single virtue of faith, which he explains by assent; and all will acknowledge that there is no justification or salvation attached to a bare assent. If you had read my work with any attention you would have seen that I had anticipated your objection, and in this very chapter. (II. Diss. iv. 10. p. 63). I have shewn in the examination of Stricture XIII. how very frivolous is the fine-drawn distinction which you make between the object of belief and that of confidence or justifying faith.

§ 7. I might here, by way of conclusion, put together a very large collection of authorities from the works of reformed divines, who understood the faith to which St. Paul attributes justification in its complex sense, that is, so far as it involves in its idea love, which is the mother of all good works. This is so well known that the Roman Catholic Estius, a writer of great judgment and honesty, objects against most of our writers for saying that 'faith and love are the same thing:' but though I am unwilling to weary both the reader and myself with quotations from so many authors, still I cannot forbear bringing forward the testimony of a celebrated man amongst the early reformers, Huldrych Zuinglius[h], who writes as follows; "All works are the fruits either of piety or the flesh: for if you are religious, you aim at those things from faith, which faith dictates. For God is in him who has faith, and he in God. But let no one say that what you attribute to faith is of love. It must be observed that 'faith' has various meanings in Holy Scripture: first credence, then firmness, and then confidence

lib. iii. dist. 23. § 7.

[h] Commentar. de vera et falsa Religione, cap. de Merito, pp. 341, 342. edit. Tigur. [p. 224. ed. 1581. vol. ii.]

in God; and we must understand it of this latter only when it is said that faith saves a man. They who do not here understand that faith, hope, and charity are the same thing, viz. this confidence in God, must needs pass over many difficulties in Holy Scripture unexplained. This will be plain from the passages 'We are saved by hope,' Rom. 8. 24; and Rom. 4. 5, 'His (i. e. the believer's) faith is counted for righteousness;' if therefore hope saves, and faith saves, faith and hope must be the same thing. Nor let it cause surprise that hope is spoken of sometimes in a different way to faith. For then faith does not mean confidence in God, but either any kind of belief, or firmness, or truth. 'But God is love: and he that dwelleth in love, dwelleth in God, and God in him,' 1 John 4. 16. And, 'He that eateth My flesh, and drinketh My blood, dwelleth in Me, and I in him,' John 6. 56; that is, he who believes that Christ has suffered for us, dwells in Christ and Christ in him. Therefore faith and love must be the same thing. And no one need be startled and afraid that these three Divine virtues are confused by us. For we have been taught by Holy Scripture that unless each of these virtues be the same as the others, it is nothing, not to say no virtue at all. If you believe in Christ, but neither hope in, nor love Him, it is nothing worth, St. James chap. 2. If you say you hope in God, but do not love Him, you make yourself a liar. For if you know enough about God to see you ought to hope in Him, it is impossible for you not to acknowledge Him to be the greatest Good: and if so it is impossible for you not to love Him. If you love, but have no trust, it is mere words, for he cannot love God who does not trust in Him. The human heart, therefore, joined to God, which is piety, has different names by way of amplification: sometimes we understand faith to mean credence, hope in the order of reason follows it, and then love: and so all this confidence of the human heart in God is called sometimes faith, sometimes hope, sometimes love: and whether you believe in, hope in, or love God, it is nothing else but real affection towards Him. Hence it happens, that sometimes these three are contained in the single idea of piety, faith is taken for love, and hope for faith." Now whoever can see any thing, must see that this is a most apposite testimony to

STRIC. XVI.

the opinion of Zegerus, that is, to my own which you call most absurd, whereas yours is diametrically opposed to it. For 1st, Zuinglius here clearly teaches that faith, to which justification and salvation are attributed in Scripture, (and specially that faith of which St. Paul says that it is counted for righteousness,) is that same confidence which comprehends the three Divine virtues, faith, hope, and love, and which is plainly the same as the whole of Christian piety, 'or the heart joined to God.' 2ndly, he clearly asserts, that unless this view be taken, there must remain many difficulties in Scripture unsolved. Without doubt he was thinking especially of the apparent disagreement of St. Paul and St. James. For he quotes particularly the passage in Rom. 4, where faith is said to be counted to a man for righteousness; affirming that unless faith is there taken in this complex sense, that passage cannot be reconciled with others, in which justification and salvation are attributed to other virtues. He moreover quotes expressly the second chapter of St. James's Epistle, to prove that faith as a single virtue is not by any means sufficient for a man's justification.

You see from this that my plan of reconciling the Apostles St. Paul and St. James is by no means new, even if you look to reformed divines: to say nothing of the ancients, whom I well know you hold for naught.

STRICTURE XVII.

ON II. DISS. vii.

In this chapter I examine a question by the way, whether the law of Moses was under any view a law of most perfect and therefore unattainable virtue and righteousness; and whether the arguments of the Apostle, in Rom. 3, and Gal. 3. 10, against justification by that law, are founded on this consideration; and the negative side of the question I support by many arguments. But the whole of my Dissertation is thrown over as wholly irrelevant; thus you write on the margin of p. 106, "With evil purpose and unhallowed pains, and quite irrelevantly, you deny perfection to the law of Moses. For St. Paul is speaking of the law which will be the rule of the last judgment, which no one

but a fool would deny is a rule of perfect obedience: see the second chapter of his Epistle to the Romans. By the works of this law he denies that any one is justified, chap. 3." STRIC. XVII.

ANSWER TO STRICTURE XVII.

§ 1. I do not remember ever to have seen so many gross mistakes heaped together in so few words. For in the first place, I no more deny perfection to the law of Moses, as you dream, than to the Gospel. For although it is most true, that the law of Moses, compared with the Gospel, is a more imperfect rule of obedience, yet this is not the question here. I deny that the law of Moses was a law of most perfect obedience in the same sense that I also deny that the Gospel is a law of most perfect obedience: in truth, from the drift of the whole of my argument it is clear that by a law of perfect obedience I meant nothing else than such a law as exacts the most perfect and complete virtue from man in every particular, as an indispensably necessary condition of obtaining salvation, while it denounces on him for the least defect of such righteousness eternal death and the dreadful torments of hell. Therefore it is to no purpose at all in the face of the plain state of the question laid down in the beginning of the chapter, in the face of the plain drift of the arguments which I am using to persuade yourself, (as not unfrequently you shut your eyes in the clearest light,) that I am labouring in this passage to prove that "the law of Moses, compared with the Gospel, is an imperfect rule of obedience, and is of less avail towards producing holiness." Observe, these are your own words in the notes on this page.

§ 2. I cannot sufficiently wonder at your saying that the discussion I have here entered upon, relative to the law of Moses, is nothing to the purpose, and for this reason, that St. Paul is speaking of another law; for I am professedly explaining the argument of the Apostle contained in Rom. 3, and Gal. 3. 10; in both which places it is quite plain that St. Paul is speaking of the law of Moses. Of the passage in Gal. 3. 10, no one in his senses would doubt, since the very words of the law of Moses are cited. It remains to be

STRIC. XVII.

enquired whether the Apostle has the same object in view in the argument in Rom. 3. I affirm that the Apostle is there speaking of the law of Moses, and I prove it by these arguments. In the first place, it has been observed long ago by far the most learned men, (do not despise their observation,) that in St. Paul's Epistles, as often as the word 'the law' is used absolutely, as in the controverted passage, without any adjunct, it invariably means the law of Moses; the reason of which is plain; for there are three laws altogether, (I am speaking of the laws which belong to fallen man,) the law of nature, of Moses, and of the Gospel. Now it is plain that the Gospel is no where by St. Paul absolutely called 'a law,' *νόμος*, much less 'the law,' *ὁ νόμος*: as neither is the law of nature, since they who have none but that, are said by him to be 'without law,' *χωρὶς νόμου*, Rom. 2. 12, and 'having not the law,' *νόμον μὴ ἔχοντες*, ver. 14. 2ndly, the context of the clause in question plainly shews that the Apostle's argument there has reference to the Mosaic law. For in the beginning of the chapter St. Paul convicts the Jews of sin (he had done this in reference to the Gentiles chap. 2), by many quotations from the Old Testament. That the Jews might not allege that these testimonies had no reference to them, St. Paul adds, ver. 19, "but we know that what things soever the law saith, it saith to them that are under the law:" where he means by 'those under the law,' Jews, and proselytes who had taken upon them the whole Jewish law. For these are said to be 'in the law' in the passage just cited, Rom. 2. 12, and 'under the law.' Immediately then the Apostle subjoins, ver. 20, "Therefore by the deeds of the law there shall no flesh be justified." Who now, but one who is wilfully blind, does not see at once, that the Apostle is here speaking of the law to which the Jews were subject, viz. the law of Moses? Who would deny again that in ver. 20, "Therefore by the deeds of the law there shall no flesh be justified:" and ver. 28, "we conclude that a man is justified by faith without the works of the law," the Apostle spoke of the same law? In the latter passage, that the Apostle was speaking of the law given to the Jews is most evident from the words immediately following, ver. 29: "Is He the God of the Jews only? Is He not also of the Gentiles? Yes, of the

Gentiles also." Where you have, as Beza has observed, an argumentum ex absurdo. "If justification depended on the law of Moses, God would be a Saviour to the Jews only. Likewise, if He saved the Jews in one way, the Gentiles in another, He would not be like Himself: He will justify both therefore in one and the same way, viz. by the faith of the Gospel."

§ 3. You speak as if there were some law which would be the rule of judgment for all in the last day, and as though this were clear from Rom. chap. 2, both which things are false. All will not be tried by the rule of the same law in the last judgment; but each by the rule of that law or dispensation under which he has lived, which the Apostle teaches most plainly in the twelfth verse of the chapter quoted. "For as many as have sinned without law, shall also perish without law; and as many as have sinned in the law, shall be judged by the law," i. e. the Gentiles, who were without the written law, will be judged by the law of nature; but the Jews by the written law of Moses, as that which was given to them.

§ 4. He who affirms that the law which will be the rule of the last judgment is a law of perfect obedience, (in the sense in which a law of perfect obedience is taken in my argument,) is not only a fool, but downright mad. For from that affirmation it would follow that the whole race of mankind would utterly perish in the last judgment.

§ 5. If a law of perfect obedience be taken according to your own meaning, viz. such a law as sets forth and displays most perfect virtue, although it does not enact or demand it at the hazard of our souls; not even thus will it be true that all men will be judged by the rule of a law which is a law of perfect obedience. For all who have been without a positive law, (which is by far the greater part of mankind,) will be judged by the law of nature, as the Apostle teaches most plainly in the passage just quoted, Rom. 2. 12; and whoever says that the mere law of nature is a rule of perfect virtue in all points equal to the Gospel, is fit to go straight to Bedlam.

§ 6. Lastly, your assertion in the last clause, that St. Paul in Rom. chap. 3. denies that any one is justified by the law

STRIC. XVII.

which will be the rule of the last judgment, is a step even beyond madness. This is just the same as if you had said that St. Paul taught that no man would be saved in the last judgment. For whereas there are but two opposite acts of Divine judgments, justification and condemnation, if no one will be justified by the law which will be the rule of the last judgment, it follows of course that all men will be condemned in the last judgment. I am ashamed and grieved, seriously and laboriously to oppose such gross absurdities; and yet you call them Strictures on a book. Cease betimes, my Censurer, if you are wise, to profess criticism in future, after having disgraced yourself so often in this specimen of your art.

APPENDIX TO EXAMINATION OF STRICTURE XVII.

Although my Censurer has with an exceeding display of ignorance carped at my Dissertation in this chapter on the law of perfect obedience: yet I confess that some learned and pious men have not been pleased with my digression on this head, from reasons that are not without show of truth. I will do my best to satisfy these persons, and if I fail in my attempt, candid readers will remember that in this chapter of the Harmony I have only modestly and with all due deference to better judgment, put forward my opinion: moreover also that the whole of this discourse is a digression, as I said: for if it be passed over, it will take nothing from our principal design, which regards the reconciliation of St. Paul with St. James.

§ 2. Here to avoid all disputes about words, I will first shew briefly what I mean by 'a law of perfect obedience.' By a law of perfect obedience I mean no other than a law distinct from and prior to the Gospel, which exacts from fallen man a most perfect virtue or conformity to the eternal law, i. e. perfect not only in all points but also in degree, and that in every particular and circumstance (as they say) such as could have been performed by the first man in a state of integrity and assisted by the aid of the Holy Spirit,—with a promise of heavenly and eternal life, if he performed such righteousness, but with the threat of everlasting death, if he turned even in the least from it. This is what is commonly called

by divines 'the law' or 'covenant of works' (but wrongly, as it has been above observed). I say 1stly, that no such law has existed from the fall of the first man. 2ndly, that the argument of the Apostle, wherein he denies that any one can be justified by the law of Moses, does not at all proceed from the supposition that the law of Moses was a law of works of this kind, but plainly rests on another foundation, viz. that that law, in the view in which it is considered by the Apostle, does not under any condition whatsoever confer true justification, i. e. justification joined with the gift of eternal life. This latter assertion we will presently in its place support against our Censurer by the plainest arguments. Here we must do our best to prove the former assertion. STRIC. XVII.

§ 3. It is astonishing what an outcry some men raise on this point. They exclaim that by this assertion of mine the whole system of orthodox divinity is ruined, and torn in pieces: that the very foundations both of the law and the Gospel are plucked up. These results, unless I am greatly deceived, square more exactly with their own thesis. For I think that the doctrine which maintains that the descendants of fallen Adam as such, are placed under a law or covenant of eternal life, such as I have described, is directly at variance with the first and most acknowledged principles of Christianity or the Catholic faith. That this may be seen more clearly, we will set forth the Catholic doctrine on this head in some clear and evident theses.

§ 4. *Thesis first.* The covenant of life entered into with Adam in a perfect state, was broken by his sin, not only for himself but for his descendants; so that all the sons of Adam, as such, are sons of death, i. e. entirely excluded from all promise of immortal life, and subject to the necessity of dying without hope of a resurrection. There is no proposition more certain than this in all theology. Every where in the writings of the New Testament it is delivered most plainly and expressly, especially in the Epistle to the Romans chap. 5. throughout. Whence also all the approved doctors of the ancient Church, as well those before as those who lived after Pelagius, have agreed therein: nor has it ever been denied by any one with impunity, or without the badge of heresy being put upon it. Now that God could justly on account of the sin of Adam alone

STRIC. XVII. have excluded all his posterity from immortal life, is too clear. For, as the most learned Gerard Vossius writes, "Although Adam had not sinned, yet might God, who is the free dispenser of His gifts, have created man for his natural end, and so void of grace in this life and glory hereafter. Now it is most evident that what God could do absolutely, that He might also have done relatively, i. e. as regards the first sin of our first parents; where He would at the same time shew that he was executing the office of a righteous judge." The position of our opponents can in no way stand with this Catholic truth. For to be entirely excluded from all promise of immortal life, and to be under a covenant, i. e. a promise of attaining eternal life under a certain condition, are two things plainly contradictory, and cannot be affirmed of the same individual. But hence it follows, that man viewed in a fallen state, if by an impossibility it were supposed that he has performed most absolute righteousness, such as could have and ought to have been performed by man in his first and perfect state, could acquire from this no right to a heavenly and eternal life. For on what title would that right depend? on a covenant or Divine promise? But man is already supposed to be wholly excluded from all promise of immortal life: is it then from the merit of this his righteousness? but all sound divines allow, that heavenly and eternal life is the free gift of God, and that of infinite liberality, such as the first man, living most exactly in a perfect state, could not in strictness justly have expected.

Hist. Pelag. lib. ii. part I. thes. 1.

§ 5. *Thesis second.* All of the descendants of fallen Adam, who are entirely destitute of Divine revelation, and who have not been acquainted with the new covenant of life, are bound by the obligation of the law of nature alone. Such were the Gentiles, whom the Apostle describes in the Epistle to the Ephesians, and whom he calls "strangers from the covenants of promise." Of these persons we affirm two things in this proposition. 1. That they are hitherto bound in obligation to the law of nature. 2. That they are bound by the law of nature alone. As regards the former it must be observed that mankind, although by the sin of the first man they fell from the more intimate grace and favour of God, yet neither have they been nor could they be exempted from Divine

Eph. 2. 12.

dominion. Fallen man ceased indeed to be the friend of God, at least so as to have near access to Him: still he remained the subject of the Most High God. And therefore, the law of nature, as it preceded every Divine covenant, so when the gracious covenant of God was put an end to by sin, it still retained its own force and vigour. In accordance with this law, fallen man is bound, in proportion to the strength left him, to do every thing which reason, when called into counsel, declares to be part of the duty he owes to God. The latter proposition scarcely requires proof. For, putting aside all Divine revelation and covenant, it is plain that nothing is left to man but the law of nature, which cannot be abolished. Moreover also, the same thing is plainly enough taught by the Apostle, Rom. 2. 12. STRIC. XVII.

§ 6. *Thesis third.* The law of nature, (i. e. the dictation of reason,) as far as it is seen in fallen man, as destitute of the spirit and the Divine revelation, by no means prescribes most perfect virtue, nor is immortal and heavenly life due to its observance. There are two parts of this statement: 1st, that the law of nature, viewed by itself, by no means prescribes a most perfect virtue: 2ndly, that immortal and heavenly life is not the reward promised for its observance. As far as regards the former, a broad field is here open for discussion on the law of nature, what precepts it contains, how far it extends, &c., where I could bring forward many things well worthy of attention, if the plan of my design did not forbid me to make such digressions. That the bare law of nature, however, does not teach most perfect virtue, is easily proved by this one argument. The law of nature is content with a virtue far inferior to that prescribed in the Gospel; therefore it by no means teaches perfect virtue. The truth of the major premiss is evident. For nothing greater, nothing higher, nothing more perfect can be exacted from man than a most perfect virtue. The minor premiss also I do not think any one will call in question, whose brain is in right order. In truth, the law of the Gospel is called by divines a 'supernatural' law on this account, because it teaches a perfection of virtue far exceeding the measure of nature. Nor is any thing more certain than that we Christians, on whom the heavenly light of the Gospel has shone,

STRIC. XVII. are bound by law to attain a far higher degree of virtue than that to which Gentiles are bound, who have only the scanty and darksome light of nature. That saying of Justin Martyr is approved (if I mistake not) by the consent of all the old divines. *Τὸ μὲν γάρ ἔτι κατὰ φύσιν βιοῦν, οὐδέπω πεπιστευκότος ἐστι.* "To be still living according to nature, is the part of one who has not yet believed." As regards the latter part of the proposition, whoever violates the law of nature is liable to the punishment that it shall seem good to the Divine justice, wisdom and equity to inflict on him: but no Catholic will affirm, I think, that immortal and heavenly life is in any wise due to the observance of this same law. For the immortality of the first man, so long as he remained in a perfect state, depended not on the law of nature (which nevertheless was most perfect in him) but on the grace and promise of God. Nay, so far from that eternal and heavenly life, which is promised to us Christians, being due to the observance of the mere law of nature, the religion of nature alone will not fit a man, or put him in the way, for obtaining such a life according to the promise of God. For natural means have no fitness to a supernatural end (as say the schoolmen). Nor am I here intruding either my own or schoolmen's fancies upon the reader. It is the universal and constant opinion of all Catholic doctors, both before and after the time of Pelagius, (with the agreement also of the most ancient Jewish masters,) that the first man was not only created with a natural integrity, but was gifted also with the Holy Spirit, by which, as a sort of principle of the Divine nature, his natural faculties (otherwise by no means capable of this) were to be raised to the obtaining the happiness of heaven (which they with good reason believed was destined for him in God's counsel, and of which they justly held the happiness of an earthly paradise to have been as it were a type). I affirm nothing here which I cannot easily prove, nay (to speak out) which I have not long ago proved abundantly in some papers written in English, in which I answered a book of Mr. Trumann, written against me in Latin, though (absurdly enough) with English idiom; and these papers, because written in English, (fearing lest the handling of certain deep questions, which had been forced upon me by the subtleties of that gentle-

man, should prove a stumbling block to the unlearned,) I have hitherto determined should remain among my adversaria, content with having communicated them to a few friends (who are witnesses of this). For if this unanimous opinion of the Catholic doctors be true, the distinction between 'natural and moral inability' (taken from the writings of Amyraldus, and supported by Baxter's authority) falls to the ground, and this the author takes as the foundation of his new theology. In fact, his hypothesis comes to this; that were it not for moral inability, i. e. (as he explains himself) for badness of will, (which meantime he affirms all have from their birth, so that this moral inability comes at last to be natural,) every son of fallen Adam, who has his right senses, is able, without the assistance of any inward grace, perfectly to fulfil the whole law of God, sufficiently revealed to him. From this absurd hypothesis he deduces many other things: e. g. that God can justly exact from fallen man most absolute virtue, though He give not, nor be ready to give grace, by which that virtue should be performed: that the law of nature itself can give eternal life to such as observe it: that the Gospel law does not bring grace with it to the performance of the obedience which it requires, but that that grace is given at the mere pleasure of God, to some few who are called the 'elect:' that all other men are justly condemned, because they could do good if they chose, although they cannot choose it. The foundation of these doctrines (which the ancient Church would certainly have determined to be most worthy of anathema) is thoroughly Pelagian and most false, unless indeed all the Catholic fathers were egregiously mistaken. For they believed (as was said just now) that the first of mankind (even in a state of innocence, when no moral weakness attached to them, and the least possible or no depravity of will; when the natural faculties, both of body and mind, were entire and perfect, assisted besides with wondrous external grace and many aids proceeding from the favourable constitution of paradise) yet were unable by their own natural strength, without the aid of the Holy Spirit, to rise to that virtue which should make them fit for the enjoyment of heavenly happiness. And therefore, here I may be allowed

STRIC. XVII.

STRIC. XVII. Can. 19. with the fathers of the second council of Orange, to argue, "Human nature, even though it remained in that integrity in which it was created, would by no means save itself, without the assistance of its Creator. If then, without the grace of God, it could not keep the salvation which it had received, how without the grace of God can it repair that which it has lost?" From all these things it follows that no one, under the law of nature alone, can by the power alone of that same law arrive at the happiness of heaven, which is promised to us Christians: and consequently, that if any of the Gentiles, upon whom the light of the Gospel has never shone, obtain the kingdom of heaven, they obtain that happiness by virtue of the new covenant established by the blood of Christ, and the assistance of some supernatural and extraordinary grace administered to them through Christ: and this our Lord Himself taught, "Except a man be born again, he cannot see the kingdom of God:" adding the reason, "that which is born of the flesh is flesh; and that which is born of the Spirit is Spirit."

Joh. 3. 3. Joh. 3. 6.

§ 7. *Thesis fourth.* God never entered into any covenant with the posterity of fallen Adam, which was not confirmed and ratified in Christ our Saviour, the second Adam; consequently into none other than the Gospel, according to the saying of the Apostle, "The gift of God is eternal life through Jesus Christ our Lord." This position, I think, is an axiom of which no Christian has a doubt; we will dispense therefore with a laborious proof of the same, as the sun need borrow no light from us. Hence follows what is worth the reader's attention, viz. that God entered into two covenants altogether, of eternal life, with mankind: the first with man immediately after his creation; the second with fallen man, called the Gospel. There is mention indeed made in Scripture of two Divine covenants after the fall of man: the Mosaic and the Gospel covenant: of which the former is called the 'old,' the latter the 'new;' the former called the 'first,' the latter the 'second.' But it is plain that in this distinction the Mosaic covenant, as opposed to the Gospel, is understood carnally and according to the letter: in which acceptation it never was a covenant of eternal life, neither was it entered into with mankind in general, but with the Jews only. We read also of the covenant with Abraham: but that was the

Rom. 6. 23.

Jer. 31. 13, &c. Heb. 8. 7, 8, 13.

Gospel itself, revealed fittingly for those times indistinctly and obscurely, as the Apostle testifies Gal. 3. 8, 16, 17. Neither is the Apostle Paul in the Epistle to the Galatians at variance with the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews: although the latter calls the Mosaic covenant 'first' and 'old,' the Gospel 'second' and 'new:' while the former, on the contrary, calls the Gospel the 'first,' the Mosaic the 'latter' covenant. For St. Paul is speaking of the Gospel, as we said, obscurely revealed; in which sense it was revealed not only before the law of Moses, as in some degree to Abraham, but before Abraham too, and it was in force immediately after the fall of the first man. Now the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews views the Gospel covenant as most fully revealed through and after Christ's advent, and ratified by the consummation of the sacrifice of our Redeemer: in which acceptation it succeeded the Mosaic covenant on its abolition. In these four positions now laid down, (of which the first, third and fourth can scarcely be denied without heresy, while the second is plain truth,) our undertaking is completed. For if the covenant of life entered into with Adam, was made null and void by his sin, not only for himself, but his posterity; if all those of Adam's posterity to whom the new covenant of life is not yet made known, and who are destitute of Divine revelation, are bound by the law of nature only, which neither dictates a most perfect virtue, nor can give eternal life to those who observe it: if, lastly, God has entered into no new covenant of eternal life with the descendants of fallen Adam, but the Gospel covenant, then nothing can be more certain than that there is no law or covenant distinct from the Gospel, and prior to it, which exacts most perfect virtue from fallen man, under a promise of eternal life, if he perform such righteousness: under the threat of eternal damnation, if he fail in doing this. So that it is unnecessary to proceed farther in this disquisition. Nevertheless, as I think it will be to the reader's advantage, I will endeavour to set forth, in some theses, the nature and grounds of the second or Gospel covenant.

STRIC. XVII.

Tit. 1. 1, 2.

§ 8. *Thesis fifth.* The Gospel, or the law of Christ, although it teaches a high religion, (especially where it is most fully revealed in the writings of the New Testament,) yet enjoins

STRIC. XVII.

nothing on fallen man which cannot be fulfilled through the grace which it promises. This statement is easily proved both from the Scriptures and by testimonies of the ancients, as also, lastly, by plain reason. First then, as is fitting, let us hear the sacred oracles. The passages quoted from St. Paul in the Harmony are the most notable: in which the Gospel law is called 'the power of God,' Rom. 1. 16; 'the law of the Spirit of life in Christ Jesus,' Rom. 8. 2; 'the Spirit,' 2 Cor. 3. 9; 'the ministration of the Spirit,' ver. 8. For from these passages it is plain that the Spirit of Christ is indissolubly united with His law, and proceeds step by step with it: so that nothing is enjoined in the Gospel law for the performance of which the grace, which it gives, is inadequate; forsooth the Gospel, as far as it is law, so far is it the law of the Spirit.

II. Diss. xi. 2.

See Rom. 8. 2—4. Heb. 8. 10. 1 Joh. 5. 3.

§ 9. As regards the Fathers, it was a common opinion of the Catholic Fathers, who lived before Pelagius, that through the grace of Christ a man could fulfil all His commands, as I have already shewn clearly, Harm. Apost. II. Diss. vii. 14. Nay, those Fathers, proceeding from the power to the act, openly taught that there are some who come to perfect virtue. Thus Clement of Alexandria. "All then are fitted for the acquisition of virtue: but one man disciplines and exercises himself more, another less; whence some have even arrived at perfect virtue, whilst others have only reached a certain point." Origen speaks more at length, where he cites and refutes the words of Celsus, as follows: "He goes on to say, They who sin not, are partakers of a better life; not explaining whom he calls sinless, whether those who are such from the beginning, or those who are such since repentance. Now it is impossible to find such as have never sinned from the beginning: and they who sin not after repentance are rarely found, and are rendered such by their coming to the saving word, not having been such before they came: for without the word, and that the 'perfect' word, it is impossible for a man to be without sin." Where Origen teaches three things: 1st, that it is quite impossible for any man to be without sin, before he is admitted to Gospel grace: 2ndly, that there are some, who after they have received the grace of the Gospel, do arrive at that pinnacle of virtue: but 3rdly, that they are

Strom. 6. p. 662.

Contra Cels. lib. iii. p. 153. edit. Cantab.

very few, and are very seldom found; that is to say, according to Origen this perfection of virtue is possible: and consequently some are found, who have attained it: yet it is an arduous and very difficult thing, and so is found in very few cases. A few lines above he had very beautifully, with a very elegant simile, explained this, in these words: "No small power, in any matter, however arduous, or, so to speak, impossible, is in the will, especially if practice be taken to aid. A man can walk on a tight rope on high in the middle of a theatre clogged too with great weights, when he has gained himself this faculty by practice and unwearied diligence: and shall the pursuit of virtue be fruitless, or ought it to seem impossible to a man, however depraved he may be?" STRIC. XVII.

§ 10. I come now to the Fathers who since the heresy of Pelagius have treated of this question. The chief of them, St. Augustine, though he was carried away by his worthy zeal in opposing that pestilent heresiarch, and in some things went too far, and in order to refute a new heresy, took new grounds, new at least as unrecognised by the Fathers of the Church, who were even then Fathers, and not sufficiently approved of by the Catholics of his own age: (this was long ago observed by most learned men, in all other respects the greatest admirers of this excellent Father:) yet he still firmly held the doctrine of his predecessors, so far at least as ever to teach (nor has he ever changed this opinion or thrown it into his books of Retractations) that it was possible for a man by the grace of God perfectly to fulfil the law, and be without sin, although he thought differently as to the matter of fact. There are clear and distinct testimonies to this effect, adduced from his writings by the excellent Gerard Vossius, and others. Thus "It is one thing to enquire whether the law can be observed in this life, so far as comes under its precepts: another, whether it has been in fact observed by any one perfectly, and without any transgression at any time: we assert the former, we deny the latter." Likewise "The Pelagians think they know some great thing, when they say, 'God would not order what He knew could not be performed by man:' who does not know this?" Likewise, "From these and similar testimonies I cannot doubt, either that God has put any thing upon man that is impossible, or

[vol. x. p. 718.] Lib. de Grat. et liber. Arb. c. 6. et 7. c. 16.

[vol. x. p. 44.] lib. ii. de Peccat. Merit. et Remis. c. 6.

STRIC. XVII. that it is in any thing impossible for God to assist and aid man in such way that what He orders may be done: and by this means, a man, if he choose, can by God's help be without sin," and "God does not then order impossibilities: but by ordering He admonishes you both to do what you can, and to ask assistance in what you cannot do." "From the very fact that *we most firmly believe*, that a just and good God could not order impossibilities, we are reminded, when things are easy, that we have somewhat to do; when things are hard, that we have somewhat to ask. For all things are easy to love, to which alone Christ's burden is light."

c. 43.

c. 69.

§ 11. Jerome thought there was no doubt about the ground of St. Austin's doctrine. For almost in the beginning of book 3. against the Pelagians, he says, "God has commanded possibilities: no one doubts this." Nevertheless he has continually denied that a man can by the grace of God live without sin. It was by a wonderfully ingenious device that he could reconcile two such opposite doctrines! forsooth that God's precepts are possible for the whole Church, but not for individuals. His words in the first book against the Pelagians are as follows: "You see," says he, "that God hath commanded what is possible to be done; and yet this which is possible to be done, no one by nature can do. Therefore He hath given divers precepts and various virtues, all of which at one time we cannot have, and so it comes to pass, that what in one man forms either the chief or entire excellence, is found but partially in another: yet he who has not all is not therefore blameable, neither is he condemned in that he hath not, but rather justified in that he hath." Also soon after he says, "God hath ordered possibilities, I allow: but we cannot each have all the possibilities, not from the weakness of nature, (that we reproach not God,) but from weakness of mind, which cannot have at once, and at all times, all virtues." This notion of Jerome, however, St. Austin has not hesitated openly to condemn as execrable blasphemy, in a well-known passage quoted in the Harmony: "We condemn also the blasphemy of those who teach that God hath commanded impossibilities to be done by man, and that the commands of God cannot be kept by individuals, but only by all conjointly." Moreover St. Austin, proceeding from the possi-

[§ 21. vol. ii. p. 703.]

[§ 23. p. 706.]

II. Diss. vii. 14.

Serm. 191. de Tempore.

bility to actual fact, thought it no dangerous error to hold, that some after conversion, by the grace of God, have lived without sin. STRIC. XVII. Lib. de Spir. et Lit. c. 2. [held A.D. 416.]

§ 12. All the canons of the Council of Milevis, which touch on this question, speak not of the possibility, but of the fact. There are altogether three; 1, that every one ought to say, "Forgive us our trespasses:" 2, and that not only for others, but also for himself: 3, and that not of humility only, but as in truth. So far, however, were the Fathers from expressly decreeing by any canon that the law of God cannot be fulfilled by the grace of Christ, that they have expressly declared the contrary. In truth, (as is found in the Greek translation of African canons,) they denounce an anathema upon those who say that the grace of God through Jesus Christ "is of avail for the forgiveness only of sins already committed, but affords not aid against sinning for the time to come[1]." They anathematize those also who teach of the grace of Christ, "that we are unable through it to love and to do what we know ought to be done." Hence two hundred years and more after the death of St. Austin, his doctrine was held as Catholic truth. The best witness of this is the venerable Bede, by far the first of the doctors of the Church of his time, and the most bitter enemy of the Pelagian heresy, who writes thus: "As to his saying that God, who is just, hath not commanded any thing impossible to be done, he speaks truly, if he regards His help to whom the Catholic voice prays, 'Lead me in the way of Thy commandments:' but if he trusts in the powers of his own mind, he is contradicted by the words of the same righteous Creator, 'without Me ye can do nothing.'" Can. 113. [vol. iv. p. 994. ed. 1563.] lib. i. in Cant. adv. Julianum.

§ 13. The Fathers who denied that man, by the grace of Christ which is promised in the Gospel, could perfectly fulfil the law and be without sin, seem to me to have meant the law in its strictest sense, viz. that original law by which the first man in a perfect state was bound, and which was a most perfect copy of the eternal law; and less properly to have used the word 'sin' in the sense of any fault or defect,

[1] Thus the Synod of Lydda also has expressly determined "that it is rightly affirmed, that a man with God's grace and assistance can be without sin." St. Aug. de Gestis Pel. c. 6. [vol. x. p. 200]. See also Council of Orange II. last Canon.

STRIC. XVII. which though it has now become part of man's nature for punishment of his first sin, and cannot by any means be entirely put off in this life, and so is not properly and formally sin, but rather, as I said, the punishment of his first sin, yet is nevertheless a deflexion from the eternal law, or law of creation. Under this class of sin comes that solicitation of concupiscence which is ever more or less harassing the best men in this mortal life, though it extort no assent of the will whatever; as also, all those defects and infirmities, which 'necessarily' flow from the faulty temperament of the human body, consequent upon the first sin, or from the loss of that most perfect harmony with which the first formed man was gifted in his creation, and which, had he not sinned, he might have preserved by eating of the tree of life given him by God. For these evils, derived from the first Adam, God would not that the grace of Christ, the second Adam, should be a full remedy in this mortal life: He willed that in some degree at least the same things should remain even in the best of men, as long as they are on their way, as marks branded in human nature, and perpetual memorials of that first sin, that thereby man might be reminded that he never ought to lose sight of his original state, whence he had fallen, but to preserve a modesty, and aim most fervently at the perfect holiness of his heavenly country. As regards unavoidable faults and defects, the most learned Archbishop of Spalato[k] holds, according to the mind of the ancients, "that these conditions, the particularities and circumstances of perfect obedience, which are impossible to human weakness aided by grace, are not now commanded." Very cautiously had St. Austin stated the question in the passage which we first cited for this thesis, in these words: "Whether the law can be observed in this life, 'so far as comes under precept.'" Whence it is evident that that most pious doctor thought that those conditions of the eternal law, and those degrees and circumstances of universal perfection, which are not possible to be done by fallen man, even through the grace of Christ promised in the Gospel, are not ordered in the new law; which is all that the Archbishop of Spalato affirmed. Thus far for the testimonies of the Fathers.

εὐκρασία

[k] Antonius de Dominis, lib. vii. de Rep. Eccles. ii. § 135, 136, 139 and 149.

§ 14. Lastly, our thesis is confirmable by most plain reason. For besides its being approved by the consent of all nations, and should therefore be counted among *κοιναὶ ἔννοιαι*, that no one can be bound to do impossibilities: (which is true not only as regards man, but even especially as regards God:) it must also be observed, that the Gospel law is a law of grace, made by a good God in Christ. And therefore though it were granted that it is not inconsistent with the justice, and consequently the wisdom of God, yet certainly is it diametrically opposed to grace, to make a law for man which it is impossible for him to fulfil. STRIC. XVII.

§ 15. *Thesis sixth.* Although according to the Gospel or law of Christ, all the degrees of virtue, which can be performed by us through the grace of the same Gospel, are matter of precept; yet all come not under a precept which binds them upon us strictly and precisely under pain of eternal damnation. For not on account of every the least failing, even such as through grace we might have avoided, does the law of the Gospel denounce on man exclusion from the kingdom of heaven, much less inflict the pains of hell: but on account of certain sins only, which are inconsistent with the end of the law, charity or the love of God above all things, and consequently with the friendship of God. Of this thesis there are two parts: 1st. That in the law of the Gospel, all degrees of virtue, possible to man through the grace of the same Gospel, are matter of precept. 2ndly. That nevertheless, the perfection of such virtue by no means comes under a precept which binds us strictly under pain of eternal death. The former is proved from those passages of the Gospel in which the whole perfection of righteousness possible to man is expressly enjoined, as Matt. 5. 48, and elsewhere repeatedly. That command especially, "Grow in grace," &c., has no bounds or limits within the utmost perfection of virtue which we can acquire through the grace of Christ; i. e. we are bound always to grow and increase in grace and virtue, till we come to "the measure of full age" (as speaks Clement of Alexandria). Whence (as a remark by the way) it is clear that there is no place in the law of Christ for works of supererogation, as they are called.

2 Pet. 3. 8.

Strom. vi. p. 663.

§ 16. The second part of our thesis is proved beyond all

STRIC. XVII.

question from those passages of the New Testament in which the penalty of exclusion from the kingdom of heaven and of eternal death is set down peculiarly to certain definite sins. There are two passages of this kind most notable: "Know ye not that the unrighteous shall not inherit the kingdom of God? Be not deceived: neither fornicators, nor idolaters, nor adulterers, nor effeminate, nor abusers of themselves with mankind, nor thieves, nor covetous, nor drunkards, nor revilers, nor extortioners shall inherit the kingdom of God." And, "Now the works of the flesh are manifest, which are these; adultery, fornication, uncleanness, lasciviousness, idolatry, witchcraft, hatred, variance, emulations, wrath, strife, seditions, heresies, envyings, murders, drunkenness, revellings, and such like; of the which I tell you before, as I have also told you in time past, that they which do such things shall not inherit the kingdom of God." In the latter passage, when St. Paul, after the enumeration of certain mortal sins, adds, 'and such like,' it is plain that he meant that all the sins that are analogous to these, i. e. which proceed from the same evil will, are to be added to the list of mortal sins recounted one by one by him. When, however, the Apostle says in the same place of those who abstain from the sins mentioned by him and such like, and practise the opposite virtues, that 'against these there is no law,' he shews clearly enough that there is no law which denounces eternal death on such men. With these passages must be compared those which speak of certain sins to which righteous men are liable, even while the observance of the law is attributed to them, and life and eternal salvation are promised them, as in James 3. 2, and elsewhere. From these testimonies of Scripture compared together, it follows that there are certain sins which do not take away the righteousness and the friendship of God, nor bring with them eternal death.

1 Cor. 6. 9, 10.

Gal. 5. 19—21.

§ 17. Here it is objected by some, that the Gospel, as far as it contains a repetition and renewal of the original law, denounces eternal death on every sin, even the slightest, and on every, even the least failing: but, that as far as it is a law of grace and indulgence, it forgives some sins to those who repent; consequently, the cause of some sins not being mortal is not that the law of Christ does not threaten them with

death, but that the same law under another view grants forgiveness of these sins on repentance. This, however, is to no purpose at all, for, in the first place, they cannot bring forward one passage of Scripture to confirm this assertion, viz. that the Gospel denounces death on every, even the least, failing. The words of St. James, which seem most to favour this opinion, are plainly not to the point, as I have shewn clearly and at length. Nor are those passages of Scripture more to the purpose, which attribute in general terms these and the like effects to sin, viz. enmity with God, everlasting perdition and death; as, "The wages of sin is death;" "He that committeth sin is of the devil;" "Thou hatest all workers of iniquity;" "The soul that sinneth it shall die:" for it will be plain to any one who weighs these passages, that they must be understood not of any sin, but of that only, which involves the whole nature of sin, i. e. sin which is called *mortal.* Secondly, They say that some sins on this account only are not mortal, viz. because, by the Gospel, they are forgiven to those who repent, as far as it is a law of grace; but no one who considers the matter attentively will be satisfied by this. For according to the law of Christ, in this view there is no sin at all so grievous which cannot be pardoned to one seriously repenting: as will be shewn in the following thesis.

STRIC. XVII.

ch. 2. 10, 11.

Harm. II. Diss. vii. 11. p. 82.

Rom. 6. 23. 1 Joh. 3. 8. Ps. 5. 5. Ezek. 18. 20.

§ 18. From these considerations a question much agitated among divines may easily be determined: viz. Whether there is any sin in its own nature venial or not mortal? For the question is not, Whether God can justly, setting aside every Divine covenant, exclude man, for the slightest possible sin, or for the least failing in righteousness, from the kingdom of heaven? For surely God could justly (as I have often reminded the reader) deny man, even living most perfectly in a perfect state, and with no fault of sin or blemish of defect, that heavenly life (inasmuch as it is a gift of His immense liberality). Nor will any sound divine question this: for those sophists among the Roman Catholics, who have not hesitated to affirm that some good works of a man, though fallen and imperfect, can of merit (putting aside the consideration of the Divine covenant) deserve the happiness of heaven, were surely best disposed of in Bedlam. Nay I do not here question whether God can justly assign a

ex condigno.

STRIC. XVII. man, in every other respect righteous, and seriously bent on observing all His commands, for the slightest failing, suppose for immoderate laughter, for a word spoken at random, or for some affection of concupiscence slightly assented to, then checked from reverence to the Divine Law and suffocated in the birth, to the dreadful torments of hell? If this be not thought a hard saying, and incompatible with Divine equity and mercy, I will no farther discuss the question. Nor indeed would I, a poor miserable man, venture to hold any thing for certain, or rashly to pronounce of the right of the Most High God, although in a matter, as it appears, quite plain. But the discussion of these questions (in my judgment) is useless, and quite away from the point: the state of the question is this: Whether, *in fact*, God hath given a law to fallen man, by which any sin whatever, even the slightest and least avoidable failing of righteousness, is prohibited under pain of eternal damnation, i. e. both of perpetual exclusion from the kingdom of heaven, and the torments of hell awaiting it after this life? Surely, (as one hath well, though in barbarous, i. e. in scholastic language expressed it,) "the ground of sin is derived from the law of God, not precisely and wholly from the nature of the act: for had there been no law, there would have been, properly speaking, no sin. As, therefore, the ground of sin, as such, 'has reference to the law of God:' so also the ground of mortal or venial sin is to be derived thence." The negative side of the question, so put, can be supported by this argument: The law of the Gospel is, of all laws given to fallen man, the most perfect, and in it is most fully 'revealed the wrath of God against all ungodliness and unrighteousness of men.' No where, surely, more clearly (no where so clearly) than in the Gospel is shewn the nature and guilt of sin, and what punishment awaits every sin in the world to come. Heavenly rewards and infernal punishments, virtue and vice, (all which in past ages were but darkly known,) since the promulgation of the law of Christ, have been put forward by God in the clearest light. Now in the Gospel the will of God is no where revealed such as that the pain of eternal damnation is decreed against any, even the least, avoidable failing of righteousness. The proof lies upon the asserter. If any

Rom. 1. 18.

one will bring forward a text by which this may be proved I will yield at once to the truth disclosed, and own myself defeated. But I have already adduced sufficiently clear passages to prove the contrary. STRIC. XVII.

§ 19. Certain schoolmen, and those of no despicable authority, have gone farther, and held that this equity and mercy of God, by which He does not decree death against every sin, belongs to every Divine covenant in common with the Gospel. For, they say, when the Most High so humbles Himself for men, as to enter into a covenant with them, He puts on the form of a friend; and among friends the least offence will not dissolve friendship. Hence Scotus, Altisiodorensis, Franciscus Maironis, Gabriel, Alimaynus, and others, have not hesitated to assert that man even under the first covenant could have sinned venially, as they usually speak, although indeed they seem to restrict their assertion to that kind of venial sin which is called of its own nature venial on account of the lightness of the matter, even if it be committed with full deliberation; for which restriction I for my part do not see the reason. For let us suppose that our first mother Eve, when tempted by the devil, had inclined but slightly to the eating of the forbidden fruit, and immediately checked herself by reverence for the Divine Law, and from the grateful remembrance of the exceeding kindnesses by which God had bound her to Himself renounced the devil's temptation, and abstained hand and heart from the tree of knowledge of good and evil. Surely in this supposition there is nothing which is impossible, or inconsistent with the constitution of our first parents. For though some say that our first parents were so created by nature that they could commit no sin which was not complete, and done with full purpose, yet this is affirmed without any grounds; nay it is refuted from the history of the first sin, which shews plainly that Eve went on by degrees to the complete perpetration of the dreadful deed. Now it is asked, whether from that inclination alone, which without doubt would have been sin, she would have fallen entirely from God's favour and covenant? He who affirms this will do so gratuitously, as he will not find a syllable in Scripture to support his assertion. On the other hand, the Divine threat was conceived in these words: "On the day that thou eatest

STRIC. XVII. thereof thou shalt surely die;" which words speak certainly of a sin fully perpetrated; to which a full determination of mind to eat the forbidden fruit, which would have proceeded to act had it not been externally hindered, would have been equivalent. For support of the doctrine, which holds that man under the first covenant could have sinned venially, some passages are adduced from St. Austin, very apposite in my judgment, which you may read with the answers to the same in Thomas Aquinas. But I will not undertake this question, but rather leave it open, as not very necessary to determine.

1, 2æ. q. 89. art. 3. and Estius in lib. iii. dist. 21. § 7.

§ 20. It will be more to the reader's purpose, I think, if we meet the abuse of the above-mentioned doctrine by suggesting some useful advice to him on the subject. We should ever remember the words of St. Bernard hereupon: "Venial sins are not deemed criminal, except when by contempt they are turned into custom and habit;" and afterwards, "The pride of the scorner and the obstinacy of the impenitent make no small fault in the matter of the least commandments, and change a slight blemish of simple transgression into a crime of grievous rebellion." Wherefore the doctrine of certain Roman Catholics is to be abhorred, who fearlessly affirm that a man can, without the guilt of a grievous offence, commit venial sins in the way of contempt: we must rather hold, on the other hand, that all sin is mortal to him who does not earnestly labour to escape all sin.

de Præcept. et Dispens. c. 14.

§ 21. *Thesis seventh.* Herein is seen the great indulgence of the Gospel, that it promises, on condition of repentance, the pardon of all sins, even the most grievous, whether committed before or after grace received; but this repentance, as regards the greater sins, which are called 'mortal,' must be exact, and perfectly worked out. This thesis, though it may not seem absolutely necessary to our purpose, yet I thought should be added, because by its addition we shall present the reader with a full view of the Gospel covenant (at least as far as is possible within the limits of this little Dissertation). The threatening then of the law of Christ, by which eternal death is denounced on certain definite sins, is not at once peremptory and absolute *in effect,* but *of debt* only; i. e. though a man who has been once involved in any of those sins, is

necessarily liable by the law of Christ to eternal death, it does not necessarily follow that he must die; for here comes in to his aid the grace of the Gospel, in which repentance is held out as a second plank after shipwreck. Now there are three propositions contained in this last thesis: 1. that in the Gospel the forgiveness of all sins, even the most grievous, is promised to those who truly repent; 2. that this forgiveness extends itself even to the heavier sins, which are committed after the grace of the Gospel has been received; 3. that this condition is required in repentance of mortal sins, that it be exact, and perfectly worked out. The first proposition we need have little anxiety to prove, as it is allowed by all Christians: the second was formerly denied by the Novatians; and to this day Christians who have fallen into sin are too frequently in doubt respecting it, so that it may be worth while to support it by a few words. STRIC. XVII.

§ 22. That hope of pardon still remains for those who after their first turning to God go back into great and grievous sins, and that they can be restored afresh by penitence and repentance, may be proved by many arguments. 1st, in the Old Testament is the well-known passage of the prophet Jeremiah preaching the Gospel under the Law, Jer. 3. 1, 2, 7, 12, 13, 14, 22, where God through the prophet—after His people with whom He had entered into a gracious covenant, and whom He had bound to Himself by the greatest kindnesses, had fallen into the sin of grievous and oft-repeated idolatry—exhorts them by many arguments and in wondrous way to repentance, or rather allures them by assuring them of the hope of pardon, and promising the healing of all their backslidings. 2ndly, in the New Testament there is the clear and universally extending announcement of St. John the Apostle concerning the sins of Christians committed after faith and baptism; "My little children, these things write I unto you, that ye sin not. And if any man sin, we have an advocate with the Father, Jesus Christ the righteous: and He is the propitiation for our sins;" where it is plain enough that the Apostle speaks of the more grievous and the more properly called sins; and that even from the conditional particles or phrase of uncertainty, 'if any man sin.' For surely he would have spoken 1 John. 2. 1, 2.

STRIC. XVII. otherwise, had he meant sins to which the best men in this life are liable, of which St. James says, "In many things we
Jas. 3. 2. offend all." So that the meaning of the Apostle is clear; I exhort you my sons, now cleansed by the baptism of repentance, to take all pains, lest ye fall back into your old sins: but if any of you have fallen into any such grievous sin, let him not cast away all hope, for we have an advocate, &c.

§ 23. 3rdly, the same is proved by the express commands of repentance in the New Testament made to Christians who have fallen grievously; which would be to no purpose, were there no hope of pardon for them on their repenting. Of
Rev. 2. 5. this kind is the injunction of our Lord, "Remember therefore from whence thou art fallen, and repent, and do the first works: or else I will come unto thee quickly, and will remove thy candlestick out of his place, except thou repent."

But most worthy of attention are our Saviour's words in the same chapter to the Angel of the Church of Thyatira,
vv.20—22. "Notwithstanding I have a few things against thee, because thou sufferest that woman Jezebel, which calleth herself a prophetess, to teach and to seduce My servants to commit fornication, and to eat things sacrificed unto idols, and I gave her space to repent of her fornication and she repented not. Behold I will cast her into a bed, and them that commit adultery with her into great tribulation, except they repent of their deeds." Here some ancients think that this Jezebel was a certain woman, the wife of a bishop, who by her fornication and perverse doctrine drew many in the Church of Thyatira to impiety. Others (and more rightly in my judgment) understand Jezebel mystically as the Gnostic party, those monsters of men, who by their dreadful doctrine of a lawful fornication, and of eating things offered to idols, against
Acts 15. the express decree of the Apostles, and by the detestable practice of these crimes, had defiled the virgin Church of Christ newly espoused to Him by the Apostles. Now this is either way equally to our purpose. For 1st, it is evident that this Jezebel had perpetrated these deeds after receiving the faith of Christ, since she is said to have usurped the office of teaching and prophesying in the Church of Thyatira. 2ndly, the crimes were enormous, into which this monster in the form of Christianity had cast herself, viz. fornication,

adultery, idolatry. 3rdly, these most grievous sins she not only perpetrated herself, but she was the author of others' doing them; and that too by defending them as lawful, and as not prohibited by any command of Christ; which was the height of impiety. 4thly, yet to this Jezebel with her associates was time given by her most merciful Lord to repent of these sins; consequently there is no doubt He would not have denied them the pardon of their crimes, if they had repented. 5thly, after they had long abused the long-suffering of God, and had strengthened themselves in their sins against the warnings of Christ through His servants, (O the mercy of our Saviour, never to be enough magnified!) the Lord denounces destruction on them, not by a peremptory edict, but with this exception, "except they repent from their works." Perhaps no passage from the Scriptures could be brought forward more apposite than this against the Novatian heresy: see however 2 Cor. 12. 21. and Gal. 6. 1. STRIC. XVII.

§ 24. 4thly. This is confirmed by the examples of David, Peter, and the incestuous Christian. Lastly, this truth which our Lord has taught us by promises and examples, He has also sealed by a Sacrament. For Christ hath instituted two Sacraments in His Church, Baptism, and His Holy Supper, and both to seal the forgiveness of our sins. Of Baptism, that it is instituted for the forgiveness of sins, no one doubts: of the cup also in the Lord's Supper, the Lord Himself hath said that it is His "blood of the New Testament, shed for the remission of sins." Hence the Catholic Church in her prayers at the altar, prays for the forgiveness of sins on account of the merit of the sacrifice of Christ commemorated in the Eucharist. Thus the most ancient Liturgy, "and send Thy Holy Spirit upon this sacrifice, the Witness of the sufferings of the Lord Jesus; to make this bread the Body of Thy Christ, and this cup the Blood of Thy Christ, that they who partake of it may be strengthened unto godliness, obtain forgiveness of sins," &c. In the same way all the Liturgies. To what purpose, you will say, is all this? Forsooth, that as by Baptism all sins, committed before the grace of the Gospel has been received, are washed away, so in the Lord's Supper is sealed to those

1 Cor. 5. 1, &c. compared with 2 Cor. 2. 6.

Mat. 26. 27, 28.

in Constitut. Apost. 8. 12.

STRIC. XVII.

who truly repent the forgiveness of all sins which are committed after baptism and regeneration.

§ 25. Against this plain truth, the Novatians of old brought forward two passages, Heb. 6. 4, 5, 6; 10. 26, 27, &c., but these passages prove nothing for them. For 1st, they plainly speak not of any sins committed after baptism, albeit the most grievous; but of total apostacy or defection from Christianity. Hence in the former passage these apostates are said to "crucify the Lord afresh, and put Him to an open shame," &c., i. e. they declare Him as an impostor, and deserving of the cross, and consequently they count all His religion as a mere imposture: and in the latter passage they are said "to trample under foot the Son of God; to count the blood of the covenant wherewith they were sanctified, an unholy thing, and to do despite to the Spirit of grace." 2ndly, as regards these dreadful apostates, it is certain, if they repent, that they will obtain pardon of their sins; to which end, in a former passage, the author of the Epistle says that it is impossible to 'renew' these deserters of Christianity 'again to repentance:' plainly intimating, that if they could repent again they might return into God's favour. 3rdly. Lastly, the most learned interpreters think that it is by no means an absolute impossibility for such apostates to repent, of whom the inspired writer is here speaking. For often in Scripture a thing which is very difficult is called 'impossible,' as Matt. 19. 23—26; Gal. 4. 15, and elsewhere. The truth is, that the more grievously men sin, the more difficult is it to do well: and where so great grace has been despised, so that it has no power to bridle and restrain a man's will, there a recovery is most difficult, nay, almost impossible. For it can only be effected by inducement; but the greatest inducements have already been despised by such an apostate. For what inducement can there be in this life, more noble, or more excellent than illumination, the tasting of the good word &c.? Meanwhile all this is no obstacle against the recovery even of such an apostate by the extraordinary grace of God. But all these things, though they are a comfort to those who have fallen grievously, and are in earnest in returning to God, yet by no means lend support to the impiety of those Christians who, turning the great grace

of God into lasciviousness, give the rein to grievous sins, relying on the presumption that they will hereafter repent of the same, and obtain pardon of them. The madness of such men is extreme; for although pardon in the Gospel is promised to the fallen on repentance, yet no where is either grace or time promised them for performing a meet repentance. To those especially our Lord usually denies this grace who presume most in expecting it. STRIC. XVII.

§ 26. The third proposition remains to be set forth by us briefly. Repentance, which is required in the Gospel for mortal sins, carries this condition with it, that it be exact, and perfectly worked out. In the first place, as mortal sins are of themselves grievous, and in the course of a Christian life are more rare and extraordinary: so the repentance, which is necessarily required for their expurgation, ought to be especial, more exact, and extraordinary. Next, the repentance necessary for the remission of mortal sins, and for the salvation of those who commit them, ought to be perfectly worked out, i. e. it ought to go out into a real and actual cessation from all sins of this kind; forsooth, that would not be a mortal sin, in which a man might persist without the loss of salvation. But repentance required for the forgiveness of venial sins, need not necessarily be carried out in every action. For even the best men can live, and die too, with such kind of sins. I add, that this cessation ought to be not only from act, but also from affection of every mortal sin: and that the very habit of sin must be shaken and cast out. Would that they who trust in what is called a death-bed repentance, would consider this seriously before it is too late, who are persuaded that they can, on their dying bed, and almost at the very point of death, perform a repentance meet for mortal sins! These men would not be charged with such folly, if (as the generality of them dream) the exclamation, "Have mercy on me, O God," a thousand times repeated, or the dropping of a few tears forced out by terror of approaching death, or lastly the absolution sought by way of custom from a priest too indulgent and too flattering to the wretched soul, sufficed for repentance from mortal sin, and even for the forgiveness of the same. But saving repentance is a far different thing. The sacred oracles cry

Ps. 51. Mat. 26. 75. Lu. 7. 38. 2 Cor. 7. 11.

Prov. 28. 13.

STRIC. XVII.

out that the old man must be put off, mortified; that the flesh must be crucified with its affections; 'this is the labour, this the work;' a work indeed, which, within the space of a few hours, can scarcely, nay cannot (except by a miracle of Divine grace, scarce to be expected by the despisers of so great grace) be performed by a man infirm and languishing, and unfit for all the common purposes of life. On the whole then it comes to this. The very least that is such, (as they say,) or lowest degree of righteousness, which is absolutely required for salvation from us in the Gospel, is that sooner or later, some time at least before we depart from this life, we rid ourselves of all sin on which eternal death is denounced by the Gospel, from all the works of the flesh enumerated by St. Paul in the passage above quoted, Gal. 5. 19, 20, 21; and to bring forth the fruits of the Holy Spirit contrary to those mentioned in the same place ver. 22, 23. Whosoever dies not in this state of righteousness, dies eternally. Hard as this saying may appear to the dissolute age wherein we live, it is nevertheless most true, unless truth itself deceive us. God grant that we think betimes on what is of so great moment to our salvation!

STRICTURE XVIII.

ON II. DISS. viii. § 14. p. 94.

Here I say that the words 'in the sight of God' in the Apostle's conclusion Rom. 3. 20, are added as significant and emphatic; "because the law had a certain justification peculiar to itself before men, which was effectual in procuring earthly happiness, but not the kingdom of heaven." Then to confirm this observation, I quote the words of the author of the Commentaries which are attributed to St. Ambrose, as an excellent explanation. "It is true that no man is justified by the law, but this is in the sight of God; for he is justified in the sight of the world so as to be safe in this life. But if he would be justified before God, he must follow the faith of God; otherwise though he be safe here, he will be guilty hereafter." You underline these words with the remark "This excellent explanation is nonsense."

ANSWER TO STRICTURE XVIII.

STRIC. XVIII.

Every where you are consistent, and every where you betray the same arrogance. Every thing that has been said by any author, ever so ancient, and in other respects of great authority in the Church, is nonsense and trifling, if it does not exactly correspond with your own trifling. Yet, most egregious trifler, this saying of our ancient writer, which I have judged most excellent, you nonsense, is supported by the voice of nearly all the ancients. Thus writes the real St. Ambrose[1]. "The law, according to the Apostle, is the schoolmaster of children, till we come to the riper age of perfect faith. Now in the law there are commands, judgments, testimonies, precepts of righteousness. Whence the Apostle says, 'the law is not of faith, but the man who doeth it shall live in it.' But as he says above, that 'no one is justified by the law,' you see that the justification of the law is a type, and an image, not the truth. In truth, then, no one is justified by the law unto perfection; in type he is justified." Nay, St. Austin himself (who seems to be the only one of the fathers you value) teaches expressly the same as our author. "'The law is not of faith, but the man that doeth them shall live in them.' He says not, 'The man that doeth it' shall live in it: that you may understand that the law stands here for the works themselves. Now they who lived in these works, feared, if they did them not, that they should be stoned or crucified, or otherwise put to death. Therefore he says, 'The man that doeth them shall live in them:' i. e. he shall have his reward, in not being punished with death." And a little after, "He who is not justified at all, neither keeps those things which have a temporal reward annexed, nor those which have an eternal reward annexed. He who is justified by the works of the law, *is not justified in the sight of God*, because he expects thence a visible and temporal reward. Yet there is in this, as I said, a certain (so to speak) earthly and carnal righteousness. For the Apostle elsewhere calls it righteousness, when he says, 'Touching the righteousness of the law, I lived blameless.'" But more of this presently.

in Ps. 118. octon. 12.

[vol. iii. p. 953.]

tom. iv. Expos. Epist. ad Gal. 3.

[1] Tom. ii. p. 464. Colon. Agrip. 1616. [vol. i. p. 1124—5.]

STRICTURE XIX.

ON II. DISS. viii. § 15. p. 94.

STRIC. XIX. Here the first argument which the Apostle uses to shew that justification did not appertain to the law of Moses,—the want, viz., of a true and eternal forgiveness, which that law could not grant,—after having been discussed at length in all its parts, is summed up at last in this syllogism.

"At the judgment-seat of God, no man can be justified by the law of Moses, who is guilty of those sins for which no remission is provided at that judgment-seat by that law:

"But all, both Jews and Greeks, are guilty of those sins for which no remission is provided at that judgment-seat by the law of Moses:

"Therefore no man, Jew or Greek, can be justified by the law of Moses, at the judgment-seat of God." Against this, with sufficient self-conceit, and your usual vehemence, you thus inveigh. "Away with your syllogism, the monstrous product of your own brain, of which neither the major premiss nor the minor premiss, nor conclusion, is to be found in the Apostle's words. I repeat till I am hoarse, that St. Paul's conclusion is, that no one is justified by the works of the law, because the law convicts every one of sin, from the guilt of which no following works of obedience deliver any man: but a man is justified by faith apart from works, through the redemption of Jesus Christ. Open your eyes, and see the difference between St. Paul's conclusion and your own invention."

ANSWER TO STRICTURE XIX.

§ 1. The syllogism which you call the monstrous product of my brain, the ancients, and among them St. Austin, attributed to St. Paul, as I have just shewn by clear proofs. But as I see you quite despise the authority of the ancients, whenever it opposes your preconceived opinions, I will put aside this weapon, (which Catholics and sober-minded men alone regard,) and will endeavour to storm your obstinacy by arguments drawn from the matter itself. These arguments, however, I have already briefly and summarily brought forward in my Dissertations: and consequently they can only be repeated here, with fresh light thrown upon them, and fortified and vindicated from your attacks. What I have to

prove is this, that the Apostle, when he says that no sinner can be justified by the law of Moses, does not use this argument for it, viz. that that law demands as a condition of justification the most perfect and absolute righteousness, such as no man can perform, even through the grace of God given in the Gospel; but rests on an entirely different ground: viz. that in this law (under the view in which it is being considered by him) no true justification at all, or forgiveness of sins, looking beyond this life, is granted on any condition whatsoever. That this reasoning is entirely the Apostle's own production, not a prodigy of my brain, is proved by these arguments. STRIC. XIX.

§ 2. In the first place, the Apostle plainly and avowedly uses this argument in his well-known speech to the Jews, too often quoted by me: "Be it known unto you therefore, men and brethren, that through this man is preached unto you the forgiveness of sins; and by Him, all that believe are justified from all things, from which ye could not be justified by the law of Moses." Where I have observed, that the Apostle teaches two things; viz., that not only forgiveness (i. e. spiritual, which the law did not grant at all) of sins is announced through Jesus; but also that in Him the believer is justified from all things, from which a man could not be justified by the law of Moses (even after the flesh); and hence the Apostle infers, that justification is not to be sought in the law of Moses, but that we must fly to another covenant of fuller mercy, viz. the covenant established in the blood of Jesus Christ, &c.; both of which inferences are thus plainly gathered from this passage. For when the Apostle says that every one who believes in Christ's Gospel is through Him justified from all sins, and that universal forgiveness of such sins cannot be obtained by the law of Moses, it is quite plain that the Apostle here views the law of Moses in a carnal and literal sense, as opposed to the Gospel. And it is certain that the law of Moses viewed in this light not only granted not remission of every sin, (inasmuch as it punished the most grievous sins, idolatry, murder, adultery, &c., with death without mercy or pardon,) but no true remission of any sin whatever, i. e. no such remission as appertained to the tribunal of God and a future life. That this interpretation Acts 13. 38, 39.

STRIC. XIX.

of mine is most true, you yourself could not deny; but I wish the reader to observe, how you meanwhile evade the force of my argument. You write thus in your notes on this very chapter: "St. Paul in his speech to the Jews, shews them how great need they had, who were clinging too much to the shell of the law, and flattering themselves in its shadow, to seek righteousness out of the law, and take refuge in Christ the end and perfection of the law; and on the ground that the law prescribed no sacrifices for the purging them of certain sins, the penalty of which was death, he proves that the people had need of a better means of propitiation, if they would not perish in their sins. From the ordinances of the law of Moses, he proves the need of Christ as a Saviour. Well. But in the Epistle to the Romans he is aiming at something else: he contends that no one is justified by works, but by faith in Christ. What can I say of him who affirms that St. Paul is urging the same point in both cases? what to think, I know; what to say, I know not. I check myself for moderation's sake." I answer: What you either think or say of me, O most moderate man, who yet are by no means sparing of ill words in these Strictures of yours, I care little; nor (to tell you the truth) have I that respect for your judgment. And he who affirms that St. Paul in both cases (both in his speech to the Jews, told by St. Luke, Acts 13, and in his Epistles to the Romans and Galatians also) is urging the same point, does not say so without the authority of the greatest men, nor without the plainest reason. For firstly, the most learned interpreters are almost agreed, that the passage, Acts 13. 38, 39, is the fittest key to the meaning of all St. Paul's argument on justification in the Epistles to the Romans and the Galatians. Hence not only our own Hammond, but even Calvin concluded from that passage (as we observed above) that the word 'justification' in St. Paul's Epistles was taken in a forensic sense, and signified 'acquittal from sins,' or 'remission of sins.' Hence they hesitated not to say that that passage comprised in the fewest words the whole of the Gospel announced by St. Paul, and asserted against the Jews. Next, the agreement of this passage with St. Paul's argument in his Epistles is plain enough, whether you regard the words themselves or

the scope of the Apostle. In both places it is affirmed that he who believes is justified, or that a man is justified by faith; in both it is denied that any one is justified by the law; in both places St. Paul is opposing the same adversaries, the Jews and Judaizing Christians: in both, lastly, he has the same end before him; viz. to drive the Jews, who did not yet believe, from seeking justification in the law of Moses, and excite them to embrace the grace of the Gospel; and to persuade the Judaizing Christians to acquiesce in the grace of the Gospel received, as sufficient to their salvation without the addition of the law of Moses. Why then should we not hold that St. Paul is urging the same point in both cases, and using the same arguments? STRIC. XIX.

§ 3. The same argument also (as is agreed by all interpreters ancient and modern) is insisted on by the divine author of the Epistle to the Hebrews, teaching that the sacrifices enjoined in the law "could not make him that did the service perfect as pertaining to the conscience;" i. e. they could not deliver him from internal and eternal guilt in the sight of God, but profited only to "the purifying of the flesh;" i. e. so that the outward man should be freed from pain and death of the body. And to this also is to be referred what the inspired writer hath elsewhere said in fuller terms; viz., that they could expect no perfection from the Aaronic priesthood, i. e. from sacrifices offered by those priests; that the law rendered nothing perfect; that the law could not make the comers to it, i. e. those who observed the worship prescribed in it, perfect. For in all these passages it is evident that full and perfect absolution from all sins, even the most grievous, is implied. As I reflect on these things, I cannot enough wonder at the barefacedness of my Censurer, who so doggedly denies that St. Paul has any where used these arguments in his discussions on justification. For most divines think that the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews is St. Paul himself: while they who think otherwise, all confess that the author of the Epistle (whoever he was, whether St. Luke, Clement, or Barnabas, or any one else) was a contemporary and intimate friend of St. Paul, and so best knew his meaning. Lastly, it is most evident that that author aims at the same

Heb. 9. 9.
ver. 13.
ch. 7. 11.
ver. 19.
ch. 10. 1.

SYNTAGMA XIX.

object which St. Paul has in his Epistles to the Romans and the Galatians, and this we just now said was both to excite unbelieving Jews to embrace the grace of the Gospel, as entirely and absolutely necessary for them; and more especially to persuade the Judaizing Christians to acquiesce in the grace of the Gospel received, as sufficient for their salvation. But what is more improbable than that St. Paul in his Epistles to the Romans and Galatians, arguing against justification by the law, should never have used the argument which is nearly the only one put forward in the Epistle to the Hebrews, either by St. Paul himself, or at least by some writer intimately allied with St. Paul, treating the same question?

§ 4. But to put the matter beyond dispute, I will bring some passages from the Epistles to the Romans and the Galatians, and these from the very heart of St. Paul's arguments, which most plainly rest on the supposition that no true justification, joined with the gift of eternal life, is given or promised by the law of Moses. In the fourth chapter of the Epistle to the Romans, ver. 13, 14, 16, the Apostle argues against justification by the law thus: "For the promise that he should be the heir of the world was not to Abraham or to his seed through the law, but through the righteousness of faith. For if they who are of the law be heirs, faith is made void, and the promise made of none effect.—Therefore it (the inheritance) is of faith, that it might be by grace, to the end that the promise might be sure to all the seed: not to that only which is of the law, but to that also which is of the faith of Abraham, who is the father of us all." Here the Apostle teaches expressly, that the promise of the inheritance, viz. of heaven, was not made to Abraham and his seed through the law, but through the righteousness of faith; and that on this account, because, if that inheritance had depended on the law, the promise made to Abraham, long before the law of Moses, would have been vain. By this argument also he proves that 'the promise' was not made through the law, but through faith, or the Gospel; (which, before the law, was preached to Abraham, and remained valid under the law, and was shadowed out even in the law itself:) because otherwise that promise would not have been firm to

ἐπαγγελία

the whole seed of Abraham, Jews as well as Gentiles, but to the Jews only; for to them alone was the law of Moses given. Whence it is most evident that the Apostle argued not of any covenant or law of works (as it is called) which pertained to all the sons of Adam, Jews and Gentiles, and which bound them to some most absolute and so impossible righteousness under the promise of eternal life, and threatening of eternal death, (as you and most of the modern divines have dreamed,) but only of the law of Moses, as far as it was given to the Jews only; and that he denied to this law not justification of any kind, but full and perfect justification only, i. e. justification accompanied with the gift of eternal life; q. e. d. STRIC. XIX.

§ 5. But the same Apostle explains this more at length and more clearly too in the third chapter of the Epistle to the Galatians, where in ver. 18 he teaches that the inheritance, viz. of eternal life and heavenly happiness, by no means comes of the law, but of the old promise concerning Christ, made to Abraham before the law, i. e. of the Gospel: so that the sense is plain, that the law of Moses, viewed literally, was never set forth by God as the law or covenant of eternal life. Which the Apostle having said, proceeds to meet the objection ver. 19, "Wherefore then serveth the law?" i. e. if it were not given as a covenant of life and eternal salvation, to what end was it? He answers, "it was added because of transgressions;" i. e. it was added to the promise on account of the transgressions, viz., of the Jewish people to whom it was given: i. e. because the posterity of Abraham, recently brought out of Egypt, (where they had associated with impious men and idolaters,) and thence vehemently addicted not only to the vices, but also to the rites and superstitions of the heathen, they needed such a law to keep them in their duty, but most especially to preserve them from the idolatrous worship of the heathen. This is the plain meaning of the Apostle; nor are all the theories of most modern divines any thing to the purpose. Consequently we find this end of the giving of the law of Moses is acknowledged by the most ancient Christian writers, who flourished in the first generation after the Apostles, and had therefore derived their divinity from the immediate disciples of the Apostles. Thus Justin Martyr: "For the sins of your people, and your idolatries, not because He was in need

Dial. cum Tryph. p. 238 [c. 22. p. 120.]

STRIC. XIX.

of such offerings, did He ordain these things." And again in the same Dialogue: "For the hardness of the heart of your people ye perceive that God through Moses ordained these things unto you, that by means of these many ordinances ye might in every action ever have your God before your eyes; and not begin to act injuriously or impiously." In like manner Irenæus: "If therefore even in the New Testament we find the Apostles giving some precepts in the way of allowance, we must not wonder, if in the Old Testament also God would have the same thing done for the benefit of the people, alluring them by the fore-mentioned observances, that through them at least they might observe the Decalogue, and so be kept from returning to idolatry and apostatizing from God." That Tertullian followed these I have already shewn in the Harmony, adducing a well-known passage of his, which I think may here be repeated. "Let no one murmur against the burdens of sacrifices and the scrupulousnesses of performances and offerings, as though God really desired such things; whereas He plainly cries aloud, 'To what purpose are the multitude of your sacrifices?' and 'Who hath required this at your hands?' but let him consider this a provision of God, whereby He would bind to His service a people prone to idolatry and such kind of transgression, by duties which were used in the superstition[m] of the age from which He would call them away, ordering them to be done to Him, as though He desired them, that they might not fall away to idolatry." To which also has reference what Justin, Irenæus, and others of the ancients observed, viz. that the ritual law was not given to the people of Israel before they had polluted themselves with the worship of the golden calf, and had so given a fair specimen of their disposition, and how much need they had of the fence of the law to prevent them from bursting forth again and again into idolatry, and at length dropping wholly from the service of the one true God. Thus Justin in the above-mentioned Dialogue: "For, without the observance of the sabbath, all those before-named righteous men pleased

p. 265. [c. 46. p. 142.]

lib. iv. advers. Hæres. cap. 29. [c. 15. p. 245.]

lib. ii. advers. Marcion. [c. 18. p. 391.]

p. 236, 237. [c. 19. p. 119.]

[m] On this account the Mosaic rites are called "the elements" or "rudiments of the world," τὰ στοιχεῖα τοῦ κόσμου, Gal. 4. 3, Col. 2. 8, 20, because they were common to the Jews and the world.

God, and after them Abraham and all his sons, even to Moses, in whose time your people making a calf in the wilderness shewed themselves unrighteous and ungrateful towards God. Wherefore God suiting Himself to that people, ordered them to perform sacrifices, as to His name, that ye might not be idolaters." The same also saith Irenæus[n]: "For God at first, indeed, admonishing them by the natural precepts, which from the beginning He had implanted in men, i. e. by the Decalogue, (without the fulfilment of which no man can be saved,) required nothing more from them; as Moses saith in Deuteronony, 'These are all the words which the Lord spake to all the assembly of the sons of Israel in the mount, and He added nothing: and He wrote them on two tables of stone and gave them me,' for this reason, that they who wished to follow Him should keep His precepts. But when they turned themselves to the making of a calf, and in their hearts turned back into Egypt, desiring to be slaves instead of free men, they received for the future a servitude fitted to their desire, not cutting them off indeed from God, but ruling them with the yoke of slavery," &c. And this observation is in matter of fact most true; for Moses, before he ascended into the mount, (about to tarry there for forty days,) had given to the people only the Decalogue, and some political laws, which are called 'judgments,' as we may see Exod. 24. 3, compared with ver. 9.[o] And before Moses had come down from the mount, the Israelites had made a calf: and we may easily believe holy men taught by the disciples of the Apostles, when they say that there was a hidden mystery in all that was done. STRIC. XIX.

§ 6. But let us now proceed with our Apostle: who after having shewn the end for which the law of Moses was given, goes on in the same place to declare the mode of legislation, exactly corresponding to that end: "The law," saith he, "was ordained by angels;" i. e. by one angel—with whom 'the Word,' ὁ λόγος, was present—pronouncing it in God's name, and striking terror into the people with earthquake, storm, thunder, lightning, in the midst of attendant hosts, (cf. Acts

[n] Lib. iv. advers. Hæres. in fine cap. 28. et initio 29. [c. 15. p. 244.]

[o] Vid. Rupert. Tuit. in Malach. p. 225, 226, edit. Norimberg. 1524. [p. 1063. ed. 1602.]

STRIC. XIX.

7. 38 with Deut. 33. 2, Heb. 2. 2,) and that 'in the hands' of a 'mediator,' viz. Moses, who interposed between God and the people. St. Paul adds, ver. 20, "But a mediator is not a mediator of one;" where Grotius excellently admonishes "ἑνὸς must be from neuter ἕν, so that the meaning is, 'a mediator does not interpose between those who are at one, i. e. who agree well together;' but God is one, i. e. ever like Himself; He changes not except when man changes. Wherefore unless many and grievous sins had intervened, God would have shewn Himself as propitious and friendly to the Israelites as He had shewn Himself of old to their ancestors; nor at that time more than before would there have been need of a mediator to interpose." In the same way hath James Capel explained this passage, observing hereupon, "But a mediator is not mediator of one party, but of two, and those disagreeing; when, therefore, Moses was a mediator between God and the people, he hereby witnesses that there was disagreement between these two parties. 'But God is one,' always the same, ever consistent. The disagreement therefore is not of God, but must be counted to the changeableness of man." And indeed this interpretation is plain and easy, and agrees with the object of the Apostle; while all the other interpretations are hard and forced, doing violence to the sense, and quite foreign to his purpose, as will appear immediately to any one who compares them. The Apostle goes on, ver. 21, meeting a new objection in these words: "Is the law therefore against the promises of God?" The question arises out of the preceding answer in this way: If the law were made by God on account of the transgressions of the Israelites, He being angry with them for their sins, shall we then confess that the law is opposed to the promise of God, made to that people, as the seed of Abraham: i. e. that God, offended, had changed His good purpose, and by making a law had cut off those gracious promises? First the Apostle casts away the objection as an abomination; "God forbid!" says he: then he adds an answer in these words: "If there had been a law which could have given life, verily righteousness or justification should have been by the law." The answer is plainly elliptical, and must be filled up in the following way; "and

then there would have been really a law contrary to the promise;" (such as would have set forth a way of obtaining life or justification, far other than that which had been ratified by promise;) "but it is quite otherwise: the law cannot give life, and therefore not true justification." Where it is plain that, "if there had been a law given which could have given life," is the same as "if the inheritance be of the law," above, ver. 18. Consequently 'to give life' is to give an 'inheritance' of heavenly and eternal life. But the law is said to 'do' or 'give' what it promises, so that the meaning is, "If the law had promised an inheritance of heavenly and eternal life." In the following words, "verily righteousness should have been by the law," the great emphasis of the word ὄντως, 'verily,' must be remarked. For the Apostle concedes (which is what we are maintaining) to the law its own 'justification,' viz. that which brings with it temporal freedom from punishment, and consequently happiness, but he expressly denies ὄντως ἐκ νόμου εἶναι δικαιοσύνην, that true justification (i. e. accompanied with the gift of a heavenly inheritance) can be obtained through the law. The Apostle subjoins, ver. 22, "But the Scripture hath concluded all under sin," or involved them in sin; i. e. hath declared them concluded or involved. A man is said to be 'concluded under sin' or involved in sins, who is still bound by the guilt of sin; thus all were concluded under sin in the sight of God before Christ came, if you regard the law of Moses in itself: since it gave no true justification accompanied with the gift of a heavenly life or inheritance, (as the Apostle has just said). This benefit flowed from the promise given to those who believe in Jesus Christ. And that promise made more obscurely before the law, and veiled under the law, was revealed at length most openly in the Gospel, ver. 23. The sum of all is: The holy men even "under the law" were truly justified, yet not "by the law," but "by the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ," Acts 15. 11. He who does not see clearly from all these things that the Apostle is arguing against justification by the law, on the ground that in that law there is no true justification at all, or remission of sins, looking beyond this life, must be either plainly rid of his senses, or clogged with an incurable prejudice.

STRIC. XIX.

ζωοποιῆσαι. κληρονομία

δικαίωσις

ver. 22.

STRIC. XIX.

§ 7. But let us hear what our Censurer has to bring against so clear an explanation of this passage. "You affix," says he, "a strange meaning to the Apostle's words, which they do not naturally bear. The law, as far as it regards the covenant of works, could not give life, because no one has fulfilled the condition of the covenant." Truly this meaning of our Aristarchus is so far from spontaneously flowing from the very words of the Apostle, that it does them most open violence; moreover it is diametrically opposed not only to the Apostle's words but also to the aim and purpose (which is plain enough) of the whole context. For first, the phrase (as we have remarked) to 'give an inheritance' or 'life,' as far as it is suited to the law, cannot mean any thing else than to promise inheritance or life; when then the Apostle denies that the law of Moses can give life, he means that life is not promised in that law. Next, what is more forced than this interpretation? the law was not able to give life to men, i. e. the law was able to give life to men, but mankind itself was not able to receive it. Besides, the Apostle is speaking expressly of the law as far as it was given by God, not as far as it was fulfilled or not fulfilled by man: "if there had been a law given which could have made alive, or given life." Nay, says our Censurer, a law was indeed given by God, which if fulfilled could have given life. Is not this flat contradiction to the Apostle? Lastly, as regards the drift of the passage, the Apostle is proving that the law is not contrary to the promise, on the very ground that this law was not put forth or made by God as a law or covenant of life and eternal salvation; consequently by bringing in a law, God by no means appointed any other or different way of obtaining salvation from that which he had before sanctioned in the promise made to Abraham, i. e. in the Gospel. The Apostle therefore is plainly speaking of the very nature or constitution of the law, not of its effect, which depended on man.

§ 8. My Censurer confidently affirms that the law of which the Apostle is speaking in this passage, means the 'covenant of works.' Now if 'covenant of works' be understood in the common sense of the phrase, (as it is evident it is understood by him,) he could not well have affirmed any thing more absurd. Divines commonly call 'the covenant

of works' that primeval or original law which was first made for mankind in their state of integrity, and which required of them most perfect and most absolute virtue, or conformity to the eternal law, which could be performed by the perfect powers of human nature unblemished, and aided by supernatural gifts, with a promise of immortality if they fulfilled that law, but with a threatening of eternal death if they declined in the least degree from it. They teach that this law continued even after the fall, and will remain so even to the end of the world: and that it binds all and every son of Adam, until they are freed from the bond of that obligation by faith in Christ our Redeemer. On this question I have stated my opinion, or rather the Catholic doctrine above, at some length. But that the Apostle in this chapter of his Epistle to the Galatians is not at all speaking of such a law or covenant, will be most plain from these considerations. In the first place, the Apostle is speaking of the law which was given to the Jews alone from Mount Sinai by Angels, Moses being the mediator, ver. 19, not therefore of a law which should bind the whole human race. Next, he is speaking expressly of a temporary law, which as it was not given till four hundred and thirty years after the promise was made to Abraham, so was it not to have longer duration than till the coming of the 'promised seed,' i. e. Christ; ver. 17, 19, 25; he was not therefore thinking of a perpetual law, coeval with mankind, and meant to endure to the end of the world. Lastly, the Apostle is speaking most plainly in this chapter of a less perfect law, which God in His infinite wisdom gave and suited like a schoolmaster to the Jews, as boys and minors, ver. 23, 24, 25, compared with ch. 4. ver. 1, 2, 3. Therefore it is certain that he is speaking not of a law requiring most absolute virtue, such as we have described. In good sooth, a law which would be satisfied with nothing short of the righteousness of Paradise, would have admirably suited an ignorant and carnal people, just emerged from the ignorance of Egypt.

STRIC. XIX.

§ 9. But, you will say, does not the New Testament every where cry out as to the great severity and rigour of the law of Moses in exacting obedience? is not that law here called expressly 'a yoke which could not be borne?' Certainly. But Acts 15. 10.

STRIC. XIX. it is evident that in these places the moral law is most especially regarded, which enjoined very many, and those most grievous precepts on the Jews, so scrupulously to be observed that the violation of even the least of them required an atonement. Certainly it is evident that the law was more indulgent to the Jews in exacting morality. Whence it allowed polygamy, and liberty of divorcement, for other causes than for adultery; nor does it seem to have been sin in any one to have made use of this right, provided he did not exceed the bounds of moderation. As to polygamy, it is plain; unless indeed we must believe (not to mention other arguments) that the most holy and the wisest men under the law were either utterly ignorant of God's will in a matter of so great moment, or else lived in sin against their consciences for many years, and even went on until death without repentance. In this as in other matters, however, so unanimous and undeviating is the opinion of Catholic doctors that the law of Christ was 'an extension of and addition to the precepts' (of Moses), *ἐπίτασιν καὶ προσθήκην ἐντολῶν*, as says St. Chrysostom, that it would be the height of ignorance or irreverence to question it. Herein then was seen the rigour and severity of the law of Moses, in that it required so strictly the observance of so many and so grievous ceremonies. Truly by that 'yoke which could not be borne,' of which mention is made in the passage quoted, Acts 15. 10, it is plain that the ritual law of Moses is meant, because it was only about circumcision, and the other ceremonies of the Mosaic law, being put upon the Gentiles, who had embraced the faith of Christ, that there was any question in the Council held at Jerusalem. In the same sense the well-known passage Rom. 4. 15, seems to me to speak. "For the law worketh wrath; for where there is no law, there is no transgression." For although it is most true that the law of nature was in many things elucidated by the law of Moses, and therefore after that law was given, many sins committed against morality were seen more palpably, and thence deserved severer punishment; yet it would seem that the Apostle here had especial reference to those numberless merely positive precepts of the Mosaic law about rites and ceremonies, which were most rigorously imposed on the Jews. For of these only is that

declaration of the Apostle exactly true, "where no law is, there is no transgression." Most especially was this exactness of the ritual law of Moses suited to the childish state of the Jews. For the childishness of the Jews was seen in that they were wanton, wilful, and prone to idolatrous rites, to which they had been accustomed in Egypt; consequently those 'troublesome scrupulousnesses' of manifold ceremonies (as Tertullian speaks) were obliged to be rigidly imposed on them, that by being occupied and kept in them, they might be drawn away from idolatry, which consisted chiefly in such kind of rites. STRIC. XIX.

§ 10. I think I have now abundantly proved that the Apostle's argument, in the Epistles to the Romans and Galatians, against justification by the law of Moses, is by no means founded on the supposition that that law required the most absolute and even impossible virtue as the condition of justification, but rests on a totally opposite foundation, viz. that in the law of Moses, viewed literally, there is set forth no true justification or forgiveness of sins, pointing beyond this life. It remains to answer, a by-no-means contemptible objection, adduced by you elsewhere. The objection is this: It is evident from many passages of St. Paul, especially in his Epistle to the Romans, that the Mosaic law is often taken by him in a spiritual sense, inasmuch as it both prescribed spiritual righteousness, and promised true justification accompanied with the gift of eternal life. Thus the law is called by St. Paul "spiritual, holy and good," Rom. 7. 12, 14; and "the commandment unto life," ver. 10. The Apostle also says that "the law is established by faith," Rom. 3. last verse, which things cannot be said of the law taken literally and in a carnal sense, &c. I answer in the words of Dionysius the celebrated Bishop of Alexandria, quoted by Athanasius: "The blessed Apostle in his Epistle to the Romans said, 'the law is spiritual:' and 'the law is holy' and 'the commandment holy, and just and good:' and a little after, 'for that which was impossible to the law, in that it was weak:' while to the Hebrews he wrote, 'the law hath made no man perfect:' also to the Galatians, 'by the law is no man justified.' To Timothy he said that 'the law is good,' if 'any one use it lawfully.' And let no one

Athan. vol. i. p. 919. Paris 1627. [De Syn. 45. vol. i. p. 758.]

STRIC. XIX.

charge the Apostle with writing contraries and contradictories, but rather admire the way in which he adapts himself to the wants of all whom he addresses: that the Romans and others might learn to turn from the letter to the Spirit; and that the Hebrews and Galatians might be instructed not to hope in the law, but in the Lord, who gave the law." From this testimony it is evident that the ancients thought, 1st, that the expression ὁ νόμος, 'the law,' was used by St. Paul in different senses. 2ndly, that the law is taken in two ways in St. Paul's Epistles, according to the letter, and according to the spirit; i. e. as far as it was the Gospel lying hid under the old figures, and veiled with ceremonies, explained to a certain extent and suitably to the time by Moses himself (especially in Deuteronomy); displayed more clearly by succeeding prophets (as seemed good to Divine Wisdom); lastly, set forth most fully and in the clearest light by Christ and His Apostles: (that third view of the law, in which it marks a covenant of works, as distinct from the Gospel, such as I have described above, was wholly unknown to the Fathers: it was reserved for their too sharp-sighted posterity to see the phantom). 3rdly, all those elogiums which are attributed to the law, viz. that it is 'spiritual, holy,' &c., belong to it so far as it is viewed spiritually, or in relation to the Gospel. 4thly, as often as St. Paul denies justification to the law, the law is understood literally. For Dionysius adduces those passages, "by the law is no man justified," and "that which was impossible to the law in that it was weak," and "the law hath made no man perfect," as parallel passages. 5thly, that the Apostle speaks equivocally; i. e. speaks of the law, at one time as spiritual, at another as carnal and literal, in accordance with the sense of those to whom and for whose sake he wrote the Epistles; and this indeed is most true. For St. Paul sometimes takes the law spiritually, especially in the Epistle to the Romans, that the Jews and Judaizing Christians, living at Rome, might learn to turn from the letter to the spirit. For although the Jews generally acquiesced in that outward righteousness which was prescribed by the letter of the law, yet they were thus blind on purpose: since Moses first, (as we just now said,) then the prophets more clearly, shewed them

the spiritual righteousness, which would alone avail to salvation; and so the Apostle with justice condemns them as guilty of mortal sin in God's sight, for being proud of the external righteousness of the law: when meanwhile they utterly neglected the spiritual righteousness, veiled indeed in the law, but from other sources sufficiently revealed to them. But when the Apostle denies justification to the law, the law is understood literally, and that again suitably. For here was a principal and capital error of the Jews; that they sought true justification accompanied with the gift of eternal life, or remission, in the letter of the law, i. e. in the ceremonies and sacrifices prescribed by the law: nay, those of the Jews who were not ignorant of the spiritual righteousness shadowed forth in the law, either thought (as has been elsewhere observed by me) that those spiritual precepts were counsels rather than precepts, or certainly they thought that the transgressions of such kind of precepts were so purged, partly by daily victims, partly by the holy annual atonement, that no remembrance of them was retained with God. By many arguments therefore, (and that to some purpose,) the Apostle shews that no one by that ritual law is justified 'in the sight of God:' that 'verily righteousness is not by the law,' or that there is no true justification for any one by the law: that those external sacrifices were of themselves a miserable refuge for sinners, inasmuch as they profited only to 'the purifying of the flesh,' that is, that the outward man might be delivered from the pain and death of the body.

STRIC. XIX.

Harm. II. Diss. xvi. 5. p. 309.

Heb.9.13.

STRICTURE XX.

ON II. DISS. ix. &c.

In this chapter and the following, I explain the second argument of the Apostle, by which he denies justification to the Mosaic law, which is drawn from the inability of that law to deliver man from the dominion of sin. To the whole of my discussion you [in the notes at the end of II. Diss. chap. xi. which I examine here for the sake of greater convenience] oppose the following words. "After your excursions, you now return to the point, and examine the grounds on which St. Paul excludes works, and what works, from

STRIC. XX. justification. You hold that because of the insufficiency of the law, which has no power unto sanctification, St. Paul excludes works which are done in our natural state without the grace of the Gospel, but with the weak assistance of the law of Moses or of nature, and by the presumption of natural powers. To these things I oppose the following considerations. 1. Your phantasy of the insufficiency of the law is no where visible in St. Paul's Epistle to the Romans. 2. Its weakness unto sanctification is a different thing from weakness unto the justification of a sinner in God's sight. 3. St. Paul does not set up a post, wherewith to engage for the exercise of the arms of his talent; but enters into conflict with the opponents of the righteousness of God. The Jews, swollen with Pharisaical pride, sought righteousness from the observance of the law, in the performance of which they considered themselves aided by the grace of God, as the Pharisee who gave thanks to God for his virtues and good works, Luke 18. 11, 12. No one contends that he can be justified by works performed without the grace of God. The Gentiles knew this, who said, *χωρὶς δαίμονος οὐδεὶς ἀγαθός*, 'no one is good without God.' 4. St. Paul speaks of Abraham, David, and all servants of God who by God's mercy are justified through Christ, and to whom God imputes righteousness without works, Rom. 4. 6. Surely the Apostle excludes works, even the good works which the faithful perform. For there can be no doubt whether or not a man is justified by bad or indifferent works."

ANSWER TO STRICTURE XX.

Before I answer your several arguments one by one, I must remind the reader that in the Harmony I have made distinction enough between works, which St. Paul, 'with respect to somewhat else,' *κατά τι*, and which he 'absolutely,' *ἁπλῶς*, excludes from justification. *In one respect* he excludes all good works altogether: viz. so far as to deny that any man by his best works can be justified through any other law than that which is founded in the meritorious blood and sacrifice of Christ. *Absolutely* St. Paul rejects only such works from justification as are either ritual, or even moral,

vid. Harm. II. Diss. vii. 2, 3. and xii. 2.

when performed by the power alone of the law of Moses (not to mention the law of nature); i. e. the Apostle has rejected altogether the external and carnal righteousness, which does not go beyond the letter of the law and the covenant of Sinai, as that which would by no means suffice with God to a man's justification, or his acceptance unto salvation. This I have proved at more length in the elucidation of the second argument of the Apostle. Briefly: the question is of the meritorious cause of our justification. This the Apostle places in the redemption and the satisfaction of Christ our Saviour alone, all works of ours of every sort excluded, and this is the object of the first argument of the Apostle. Again, the question is of the indispensable cause of our justification, or of the condition required on our part. Here St. Paul does not exclude all works altogether from justification, but either ritual works of the law, or even moral outward works, which could be performed without the special grace of the Gospel, and the Spirit of Christ. And to this point the second argument of the Apostle is directed, which I have unfolded in this ninth and following chapters of the second Dissertation. I must here repeat these things, because there is no harm in taking every precaution (as you have warned me); nay it is actually necessary to my purpose, since I have to dispute with so unfair an adversary, so utterly estranged from all Christian candour, as to distort every thing I say. STRIC. XX.

§ 2. Thus much premised, I come to the arguments with which you oppose my statements in the ninth and thirteenth chapters of the second Dissertation. Let your first argument come forth into the field: "Your phantasy respecting the insufficiency of the law is no where visible in St. Paul's Epistle to the Romans." I answer: If all which I have said at some length, in five whole chapters, on the inability of the Mosaic law (viewed according to the letter) to beget saving piety in men, and which I have supported by sound testimonies from St. Paul; if, I say, all this is the mere phantasy of my dreaming brain, and is no where visible in St. Paul, then I shall despair for the future of ever being able to state any thing at all as certain: I should hold (if Pyrrho's school could hold any thing to be certain, established, or fixed) that

STRIC. XX. of all mortals the sceptics were the wisest, and that in human matters there is nothing certain to be found. Let any fair judge read those five chapters seriously, attentively, and impartially, and let him decide whether I am deluded by a phantasy, or whether my censurer is not rather doing homage to his own impudence.

§ 3. Your next argument comes forth. "Weakness unto sanctification is a different thing from weakness unto the justification of a sinner in God's sight." I allow it. Nevertheless, these two things are so intimately connected, one with the other, that they cannot be separated from each other: and so the law, which is weak unto sanctification, i. e. the deliverance of a man from the dominion of sin, will be weak also unto justification: so that it is absurd for you to be continually objecting in this Stricture, that I confound justification with sanctification. I have never done so, nor am I likely to do so. Nevertheless, I constantly affirm that justification by Divine appointment presupposes sanctification, at least the primary and less perfect sanctification. For God, though He justify the ungodly through Christ, (Rom. 4. 5,) i. e. him, who having been such, yet through faith and true repentance has ceased to be such, nevertheless will not justify the ungodly, Exod. 34. 7, i. e. him who still remains in his wickedness. Briefly: it is inconsistent with the righteousness of God (as we have said elsewhere) to forgive any man his sins, and withal to give him a right to a heavenly life, who is not cleansed from his sins, nay, who is not also in a manner made partaker of 'the Divine nature.' Rightly therefore, and most wisely does the Apostle, speaking of the law of Moses, conclude from its weakness unto sanctification, its weakness unto justification. I wonder at this being questioned by any one who observes that in the very context of the argument, in which he contends that no one is justified by the law of Moses, St. Paul has inserted so many things about the weakness of this law. What then! has the most grave and inspired Apostle spoken irrelevantly, or was he ignorant what would suit his cause?

§ 4. I come to your third argument. "St. Paul," you say, "does not set up a post," &c. When I first read this argument I was fairly astonished; I could never have believed

(had you not forced my belief by such a monstrous instance) STRIC. XX.
that party feeling could have had such power. To wit. To make me seem heterodox, the whole world, on the question of necessity of grace, is made orthodox. So the Pharisees, the proudest of the Jews, thought most rightly on the necessity of grace; nay the Gentiles, as regards that question, were wise enough; and St. Paul would have been trifling and fighting with a shadow, had he spoken against works done by natural powers without the grace of God. Could you believe your ownself, when you were telling this pretty little tale? I can scarce believe it. You could not be ignorant that I had proved in the fifteenth chapter of II. Diss. from the Scriptures, Josephus, and Rabbis, that all the "masters of Israel" lived in profound and most gross ignorance of grace; the Sadducees holding the absolute power of free-will, while the Pharisees gave to fate and to the stars the honour due to Divine grace. You were not unaware that in § 19 of the same chapter I had set myself to answer your objection about the Pharisee's giving of thanks. Hence you write thus at the end of that chapter: "St. Paul was the strenuous advocate of Divine grace against the proud conceit of our natural powers and works having any power in regeneration. But in the argument on justification, which he begins and goes through with in the Epistle to the Romans, he is avowedly not speaking of the efficacy of sanctifying grace. This Dissertation therefore, though full of great learning, throws no light on the state and determination of the question." Where you pretty evidently allow that what I have said in this chapter is true, though not to the point. Besides, if St. Paul were a strenuous advocate for Divine grace against the proud conceits as to our natural powers, then there must have been men who entertained those proud conceits, or the Apostle would have stuck up a post to fight with. But who could these men be? Jews? you deny that. Gentiles? you will not allow that. But thus do men vary (as a great man of old has truly said) who do not speak from truth, but say every thing artificially.

§ 5. To your fourth and last argument about Abraham and David, I am obliged more than once to inform the reader that I have given a full answer in Harm., II. Diss. xii. 14, 15.

STRIC. XX. Where I have also shewn clearly (same chapter, § 13.) that the appendix of this argument, viz. that it never could be questioned whether a man is justified or not from bad or indifferent works, is an impertinent cavil.

STRICTURE XXI.

ON DISS. II. x. 3. p. 118.

In this chapter, as I am about to explain more clearly the Apostle's argument drawn from the weakness of the law, I observe that the old law laboured under the defect of both assisting graces, viz. the external, or the promise of eternal life, and the internal, or the gift of the Holy Spirit. As regards the former, I observe that it is no slight proof of the weakness of the law, that its promises and threatenings, in which the force of every law lies, were merely temporal and earthly. After having explained this briefly, I conclude the section thus: "The law therefore of Moses, which promises nothing beyond this life, could not produce in men a sincere, ardent, and indefatigable love of virtue." To this you reply: "How near akin to blasphemy is this derogation from the law of Moses, which is directly opposed to Christ's words in the parable of the rich man, Luke 16. 29, and elsewhere; see John 5. 39. This comes out of the pools of Socinus. You do not understand Moses better than the Sadducees, whom our Saviour proved to be ignorant of Scripture. The law of Moses embraced and taught much more than a mere covenant concerning the possession of Canaan in peace."

ANSWER TO STRICTURE XXI.

§ 1. I would wish for your own sake, that your choler were not here so hot against me; for certainly either your zeal "not according to knowledge," or the immoderate desire of defending a rashly conceived hypothesis, has hurried you beyond all bounds of Christian truth, candour, or moderation. You say that this doctrine of mine has been drawn out of the pools of Socinus; (that most impure father of heresy;) that I know no more of the Old Testament than did the Sadducees: lastly, that this doctrine is near akin to blasphemy. Heavy indeed is the charge, if it be true; but heavy on the other

hand is your calumny, if it be false. Would that you could as easily free yourself from the charge of reviling, as I can vindicate my statement from the odium with which you have loaded it. STRIC. XXI.

§ 2. To make the subject clearer, I remind the reader that in this chapter of my book I have cautiously and carefully explained in what sense I have affirmed that eternal life is not promised in the Old Testament. First, I expressly avow that by the Old Testament I mean with the Apostle, Gal. 4. 24, the covenant made on Mount Sinai with the Israelites, Moses being the mediator, as distinguished from the Old Testament, taken in a wider sense, and comprehending all that is contained in the books of Moses, and the holy writings of the Prophets. Nay, to this distinction of the law, which I learned from St. Austin, I expressly call the attention of the reader. Then, I say, that the covenant of Mount Sinai can be viewed in two ways, carnally and spiritually: carnally, as it was an instrument ordained for a carnal people for a temporal advantage; spiritually, as it promised heavenly things to those endued with the Spirit of God, under the types of carnal things. Hence I allow that it is true both that these earthly promises, given to the law of works, were signs of the good things which belonged to the law of the Spirit, and that by God's intention these were comprehended under them: and also that there are in the law itself general promises, or promises made in general terms, in which it is plain that eternal life not only can be, but in the Divine intention also was comprehended. These things I gather from the interpretation of Christ Himself and His Apostles, Mat. 22. 31, 32; Heb. 11. 16, &c. The whole I sum up in these few words: "In a word, the law, in a carnal and literal view, did not require spiritual righteousness, nor promise eternal life; but, spiritually considered, was the very Gospel itself; and when taken in this sense, the Apostle raises no objections concerning it." Lastly, I do not deny but that the better and more clear-sighted among the Jews were induced by many reasons (which I enumerate in this chapter, § 9.) to believe that besides the special good things pertaining to this life, and expressly promised in the law of Moses, God meant to bestow others on His faithful worship- Harm. II. Diss. x. 8. p. 123.

STRIC. XXI. pers; nay, I say that it is most certain, unless pious and eminent men among the people of God can be supposed to have lived and died as beasts. I add (§ 10.) that the prophets who flourished in particular ages among God's people, unfolded even to the people, according to their capacity, the mysteries of the life to come, which were hidden in the law.

§ 3. So that it is evident from hence, that you have either read my book quite inattentively, or have written these Strictures on it in despite of your conscience, fixing as you do upon me so often the contrary to what I have written. Thus in the notes at page 213 of my book, as you are about to contend with me, or rather with your shadow, you say, "The law of Moses carried the Gospel veiled in the ceremonial law. God, even in the Old Testament, taught and required of His people a spiritual righteousness; and the law of Moses did not annul the promises made to the patriarchs. The faith then, by which Noah, and Abraham, and the other servants of God were made heirs of the promises, flourished also under the law." I allow all this, and in the book which you have carped at in these Strictures, have often avowed in terms that I allow it. So in notes at page 215, when I shew from the well-known passage of the Epistle to the Hebrews 7. 19, that the hope of a better life, with which we approach God, depends not on the covenant of Sinai, viewed according to the letter, but on the Gospel, of old indeed darkly revealed, and afterwards brought in more fully, you oppose me thus: "What sober reader would you persuade that no one approached God under the Old Testament, and found God propitious through Christ?" I ask in turn from you, Who in his senses could think that I wished to persuade any one such a thing?

§ 4. To return therefore to my purpose: when I assert that eternal life is not promised in the Old Testament, I mean this: that the promise of eternal life is not contained in the covenant of Sinai in its literal sense, nor was that promise made to the outward righteousness exacted according to the letter of the law; but whatever spiritual and eternal good was hiddenly and secretly comprehended by God's intention in the words of that covenant, all related to the New Testament or the Gospel, veiled and shadowed out

under the Old Testament. Now if this be Socinianism, Sadduceeism, or blasphemy, then (I shudder as I write the words) have the inspired writers of the New Testament, as I have shewn at length in examination of the nineteenth Stricture, put Socinianism, Sadducecism and blasphemy before us in many passages: then also were the most approved ancient writers in the Church, who before us, as a body, have held this opinion, Socinians, Sadducees, Blasphemers. See Gerard. Vossius Resp. ad judicium Ravenspergeri, c. 23 throughout. There that eminent man has compiled from the ancients, chiefly from St. Austin, a vast heap of testimonies, which both confirm and excellently explain this doctrine. STRIC. XXI.

§ 5. Nay, it is evident that this doctrine, which you have decried thus fearfully, was the common judgment of all Catholics, in the age in which St. Austin flourished. For thus he writes against Faustus the Manichæan: "That temporal promises are contained in the Old Testament, and that it is on that account called the Old Testament, no one of us doubts, or that the promise of eternal life and the kingdom of heaven belong to the New Testament." What if your hypothesis in opposition to my doctrine, viz. that eternal life is promised in the Old Testament, as such, was condemned in Pelagius by the Catholics in St. Austin's time as erroneous, if not heretical? This no doubt will seem strange to you, but believe your own eyes: St. Austin says that it was objected against Pelagius by the Catholics in the Synod of Lydda that he taught in his writings, "that the kingdom of heaven was promised in the Old Testament:" that Pelagius, however, cleared himself before the Synod somewhat deceitfully, in that he brought forward testimonies not indeed from the Old Testament properly and strictly so called, i. e. from the words of the covenant of Sinai, but from the writings of the Old Testament taken in its wider sense. St. Austin exposed this fraud in these words: "Another thing was quoted which he wrote in his book; 'the kingdom of heaven is promised even in the Old Testament;' to which Pelagius answered, This can be proved from the Scriptures, though it is denied by heretics to the wronging of the Old Testament. But I have followed the authority of the Scrip-

vol. vi. l. 4. c. 11. [lib. iv. c. 2. vol. viii. p. 193.]

vol. vii. de gestis Pelagii, c. 5. [vol. x. p. 198.]

STRIC. XXI. tures in saying so, since it is written in the prophet Daniel, 'But the saints of the Most High shall take the kingdom;' Dan. 7. 18. and when this answer was received, the Synod said 'that this was not opposed to the Church's faith.' Was it without reason then, that our brethren were moved to object to these words among other things? No surely, but the words 'Old Testament' are spoken of in two ways: in one way according to the authority of Holy Scripture: in another way according to the customary way of speaking. For St. Paul speaks thus to the Galatians: 'Tell me,' says he, 'ye that desire to be under the law, do ye not hear the law? for it is written, that Abraham had two sons, the one by a bond-maid, the other by a free-woman: which things are an allegory: for these are the two covenants; the one which gendereth to bondage, which is Agar; for this Agar is Mount Sinai in Arabia, and answereth to Jerusalem which now is, and is in bondage with her children: but Jerusalem which is above is free, which is the mother of us all.' Since then the Old Testament gendereth to bondage, it is said, 'Cast out the bond-woman and her son, for the son of the bond-woman shall not be heir with my son Isaac:' but the kingdom of heaven which is unto liberty, how pertaineth this to the Old Testament? Since however, as I have said, we usually speak so as to call all the Scriptures of the Law and the Prophets, which were delivered before the incarnation of our Lord, and come under the authority of the canons, by the name of the Old Testament; who, that is ever so little learned in ecclesiastical writings, knows not that in those Scriptures the kingdom of heaven could be promised, even as also the New Testament, to which the kingdom of heaven belongs?" St. Austin also, in the eleventh chapter of the same book, relates that Pelagius was forced by the Fathers of that Synod, among other things to condemn in terms this doctrine of his, if he would escape condemnation. These are St. Austin's words: "We see then and hold, that the most pernicious evils of such heresy as this, viz. 'that Adam was made mortal,' were condemned not only by Pelagius but also by the holy Bishops who presided over that Council; and that this heresy might be more fully explained and set forth, it is added, 'Whether he sinned, or sinned not, he was to

die; that his sins hurt him alone, and not mankind; that the law conducts to the kingdom even as the Gospel.'" STRIC. XXI.

§ 6. No one ought to wonder that the Catholic doctors so severely opposed the doctrine of Pelagius, viz. that "eternal life is promised [p] in the old law, as distinguished from the Gospel," since it is at open war with the two first principles of Christian faith (set forth in the examination of Stricture XVII., in the first and fourth Theses): viz. 1st. that the covenant of life entered into with Adam in a perfect state was made void through his sin not only to himself, but to his posterity, so that all the sons of Adam, as such, are sons of death, i. e. entirely shut out from all promise of eternal life. 2ndly, that God hath entered into no covenant of eternal life with the descendants of fallen Adam, which has not been confirmed and ratified in Christ our Saviour; and therefore none other than the Gospel. Hence also Pelagius inferred that a man might by any law, even by that of nature, obtain heavenly and eternal life. But to resume the main subject.

§ 7. Some light will be thrown on these passages of St. Austin, by a passage of Jerome, where he thus addresses Critobulus (who in these dialogues sustains the character of Pelagius): "You add besides, 'that the kingdom of heaven is promised also in the Old Testament,' and you bring forward quotations from the Apocrypha: whereas it is plain that the kingdom of heaven was first preached in the Gospel through John the Baptist, and the Lord our Saviour and the Apostles. Read the Gospels, &c. But you call us Manichæans, because preferring the Gospel to the Law, we say that in the latter is the shadow, but in the former the truth: while you do not perceive your own folly and impudence. It is one thing to condemn the Law as a Manichæan does; another to prefer the Gospel to the Law as the 'Apostles' do," &c. In this eminent testimony, besides that it is most evident that the doctrine, which is contrary to ours, was condemned of old by Catholics in Pelagius, two things are especially to be observed. 1st. That Pelagius sought the proof of his assertion in general from no other place than the writings of the lib. i. advers. Pelag. [§ 31. vol. ii. p. 714.]

[p] Let Mr. Trumann therefore see how he will clear himself of having dared barefacedly to defend the very dogma of Pelagius.

STRIC. XXI.

Harm. II. Diss. x. 11, 12.

Apocrypha: and as these were written some time after the Babylonish captivity, when the doctrine of a future life (as has been observed elsewhere in the Harmony) was more clearly known, it is no wonder if this doctrine is set forth there most distinctly. 2ndly. That the Heresiarch charged the Catholics of his age with Manichæism, because they taught that the kingdom of heaven was not promised in the Old Testament: as though, with that blasphemous teacher, they had defamed the law of God given by Moses. You will see therefore, my Censurer, whether you yourself are not guilty of somewhat akin to the crime of Pelagius in venturing to brand me with the mark of heresy and even of blasphemy, for asserting this very Catholic doctrine.

§ 8. Let the learned reader learn from your example, how ill-advised it is to spend all one's labour and study over the writings of Systematics and Neoterics, while entirely neglecting or but carelessly reading the remains of the ancients. In truth, besides other sufficiently grievous mischiefs, it generally happens that they repudiate Catholic doctrines as heretical, while on the contrary they take up and embrace the exploded madnesses of heretics as Divine oracles. And therefore, O young men, if you would not be deceived by these would-be theologians, next to the Holy Scriptures,

"Be the Fathers' works
"By day and night for ever in your hands."

STRICTURE XXII.

ON II. DISS. x. 4. p. 119.

Here I say, "the Mosaic law, by containing only temporal promises and threatenings, was therefore adapted to produce in men a mean and sordid spirit and disposition, entirely foreign to true and genuine piety," &c. Upon this you inflict the severe censure, "Restrain, I entreat you, the petulance of your tongue, chattering against the wise economy of God. Does not Moses, throughout the whole almost of the book of Deuteronomy, by these same arguments excite and turn the people to believe, fear, love, and obey God? Are Divine benefits unfit to raise the mind to God? Did not Moses, or the Lord Himself in the law of Moses, consult

for religion, and provide against this ingratitude? But you reproach God, when you rashly assert that the law, which was ordained by God to produce piety, could not effect it. You load a pure and holy law with calumnies, as though it were the nurse of avarice and intemperance. The fountain surely is defiled whence this corrupt and unwholesome channel flows. Correct your words by the better judgment of David concerning the law of God, given by Moses, which is open for you to read." STRIC. XXII. Ps. 19. 7, 8.

ANSWER TO STRICTURE XXII.

§ 1. Better language I pray, good Aristarchus! restrain your own anger, or rather madness, and with tranquil and steady judgment see if this waggon-load of reproaches which you have heaped on me, a poor wretch already enough bruised and afflicted, does not at length fall upon the most holy Fathers of the Church, and even upon the inspired writers. I am speaking of the law or covenant of Sinai taken in its carnal and literal sense, as promising nothing beyond these carnal and earthly advantages. I say that that law thus viewed, was calculated to produce in men a mean and sordid disposition, utterly at variance with true and genuine piety. Who in his senses would ever question it? the very plainness of the fact cries out that what I say is true. I ask you, when you shall have returned to yourself? Since true and genuine piety consists chiefly in self-denial, in contempt of this world, in a mind panting for a future and a better life, was it possible that the law of Moses should produce this piety in man, viewed in its carnal and literal sense, as promising no advantage beyond this life?

§ 2. But if he who has said this, must be held to have chattered with petulant tongue against the wise economy of God, to have reproached God Himself, &c., what then (not to mention all the other Fathers) will become of St. Austin himself? Thus he writes[q]: "Although in the Old Testament, on account of the promise of temporal goods, and threatening of temporal evils, the temporal Jerusalem brings

[q] Tom. vi. contra adversarium Legis et Prophetarum l. 17. [vol. viii. p. 566. § 35.]

STRIC. XXII. forth slaves, while in the New Testament, where faith wins love, whereby the law may be fulfilled no less by the love of righteousness than by the fear of punishment, the eternal Jerusalem brings forth free men: yet even in those times were there spiritually righteous men who were not slain by the letter, which commanded, but were made alive by the Spirit, which aided them." Also[r]; "From the natural sense, because the natural man perceiveth not the things of the Spirit of God, arise all dissensions and schisms; and all who go on guided by this sense, the Apostle says, belong to the Old Testament, i. e. to the desire of earthly promises: in which indeed spiritual things are figured, but the natural man perceiveth not the things of the Spirit of God," &c. Again[s]; "It is plain that even that Scripture which was given to the elder people, was the law of Christ, which He came to fulfil by love, but which was not fulfilled through fear. The same Scripture therefore, while it depresses slaves bent upon earthly goods, is called the Old Testament, but is called the New Testament as elevating free men burning for eternal goods."

§ 3. But why do I speak of the Fathers? St. Paul the Apostle (whose authority you abuse every where for the confirmation of your own dreams) says the same plainly as we.
Gal. 4. 24. Speaking of the covenant of Sinai, as it is opposed to the Gospel, he says that that covenant 'gendereth to bondage.' But what is this bondage? Hear a most learned interpreter. "The bondage to which the Old Testament begat its sons consisted partly in the unbearable yoke of ceremonial precepts, laid upon the necks of its sons: partly in the servile affections and fear, by which they were governed: which
Rom.8.15. the Apostle calls 'the spirit of bondage to fear.'" And therefore this bondage is especially that servile disposition with which men under the Old Testament, clinging to its letter not from the love of righteousness, as sons, but from the hope of impending good, and fear of impending evil, as slaves and hirelings, performed the service of God. However therefore you interpret the 'spirit of bondage,' this is plain,

[r] Vol. vii. contra Donatistas 1. 15. [de Baptismo contra Donat. 1. 23. vol. ix. p. 92.]

[s] Tom. iv. Expos. ad Gal. 6. [§ 58. vol. iii. p. 976.]

that this spirit is opposed by the Apostle to 'the spirit of adoption,' or the free ground of serving God, which is enjoined on us Christians; and therefore comes to that mean and sordid disposition of which I spoke, entirely foreign to true and genuine piety. Now St. Paul says that the covenant of Sinai 'gendereth to bondage' of this kind, because it is naturally adapted, by force of its promises and threatenings, to implant such a disposition in men. STRIC. XXII.

§ 4. The judgment of David in Psalm the nineteenth, which you appeal to, is not to the purpose. For the law of God, which that holy man there and continually in other places so much eulogizes, must by no means be restricted to the law or covenant of Sinai (of which alone I am speaking): but (as Vatablus on the first and second Psalm remarks) comprises not only the law, but also all the books of Holy Scripture which had been written up to his time, which are an exposition of the law. As regards this, David (if any one) was thoroughly enough aware of the mysteries hidden in the carnal law, and was among the chief of those spiritually-minded men, who, in St. Austin's words just quoted, "lived in the sacraments of the Old Testament, but hiddenly belonged to the New Testament which then was hidden." So that the words in which a most ancient father and martyr, St. Justin, rebukes the unskilfulness of the Jews in interpreting the writings of the Old Testament, suit you and such as you exactly. "You deceive yourselves by equivocal expressions. For where the law of the Lord is called blameless, you understand it not as that which was to be after Moses, but as that which was made by Moses; though God Himself proclaims that He will make a new law and a new covenant." Dial. cum Tryph. p. 251. [c. 34. p. 131.]

§ 5. It may here be objected, If the law of Sinai was calculated to engender that servile disposition in men, must it not be imputed to God, the Author of that law, that most of the Jews did not rise above that servile disposition? I answer, Far from it. For it was sufficiently provided by Divine care, that the Jews should not remain in the letter of the law of Sinai. For God provided that the tradition of a future life, handed down from the patriarchs, (whether derived immediately from Himself, or taught in other ways, as espe-

STRIC. XXII.

cially by the preaching so also by the example of Enoch,) should flourish even under the law, and should both be explained and confirmed by the preaching of prophets, whom from time to time He raised up among His people. Whence it is evident that the existence of the soul after the death of the body was believed by the oldest of the Jews who lived after the law of Moses was given. This, I say, is evident (not to mention other arguments) from the history of Saul consulting and seeking the witch in order to have a conference with Samuel, who was already dead: which of course he would not have done, had he not believed that the soul of the dead prophet still survived. Surely the *νεκύια*, the most ancient of all divinations, was a sign (as has been observed by a most eminent writer) of the belief in the permanency of souls after death. But to what purpose would the soul exist after the death of the body, were not its life to be wretched or happy, according to what it had done in the body? That spiritual righteousness also, to which alone (not to external and carnal righteousness, prescribed in the letter of the law of Sinai) the promise of eternal life was given, was sufficiently revealed by God to the Jews from time to time, both by Moses and by succeeding prophets. Moses himself, in the sermon in Moab, or in Deuteronomy, (which you would rightly call the Gospel of Moses,) often, as it were, recalls the Israelites from the external ceremonies of the law, which he had just given them, to internal piety; from the circumcision of the flesh, to the circumcision of the heart; and warns them expressly, that what all their salvation turns upon, is their obedience to one precept, loving God with all their hearts, for the performance of which precept he promises them grace and assistance in God's name. See especially Deut. 10. 12—16; 30. 6. The same was done and in clearer words by the prophets, who succeeded Moses, as one may see 1 Sam. 15. 22; Ps. 50. 7—17; 51. 16, 17; Isaiah 1. 10—21; Jer. 7. 21—23; Hosea 6. 6; Mich. 6. 6—8, and continually in other places; and therefore the Jews were without excuse, who in St. Paul's time clung to the letter of the law of Sinai: whether they were Pharisees, who while they acknowledged indeed a mystery in the letter of the promise, yet looked not beyond the letter of the precept: or

Jude ver. 14.

Gen. 5. 24.

vid. Harm. II. Diss. xi. 3.

whether they were Sadducees, who took both promise and precept according to the letter of the Mosaic law. But enough of this. STRIC. XXII.

§ 6. What follows in my second Dissertation concerning the Apostle's argument relative to the ritual law of Moses (ch. xiv.), concerning Jewish doctrines (ch. xv. xvi. xvii. and the contents of the epilogue of the work), on being carefully on our guard against four several errors in this question of justification, are so plain and easy (though our Censurer has even nibbled maliciously at some of these, but to no purpose) that they really need no defence. One Stricture only of the Censurer, relating to the judgment of the Church of England on this point, now remains to be briefly disposed of.

STRICTURE XXIII.

ON II. DISS. xviii. 6. p. 196.

Here, in the epilogue of the work, seriously advising the reader to beware of the four errors on this important question of justification, I first attack their error who attribute merit of condignity to the good works of men. As the best antidote to this error, or rather heresy, I oppose the decision of our Church in these words: "From this error in particular, concerning the merit of good works in the matter of justification, our Holy Mother, the English Church, would guard her sons, by the eleventh article," &c. These words you attack most severely. "I am astonished at your citation of the article of our Church. Who can help seeing your blindness as well as shamelessness? the former, in that you shut your eyes to the Solifidianism (as you love to stigmatize my doctrine) therein expressed; the latter, in that you have dared to tamper with the judgment of our good mother, partly by ill-patched sophisms, partly by unseemly reproaches." Afterwards (in margin of p. 340) you call me "a most shameless interpolator of Holy Scripture and ecclesiastical doctrine." meritum ex condigno

ANSWER TO STRICTURE XXIII.

§ 1. I allow that you have here (as constantly elsewhere) brought forth fruit worthy of your own Solifidianism, (not

STRIC. XXIII. such as our Holy Mother the English Church teaches, God forbid!) For, trusting in your own justifying self-confidence, just as though there were no account to be rendered hereafter of your words and actions at Christ's tribunal, as though you cared little for, nay wholly despised that tremendous sentence of the Holy Spirit, declaring that revilers together with sinners of a darker dye, have no inheritance in the kingdom of heaven, you continually and shamelessly inveigh against, hew, and hack at your brother, (as you call me,) with the most violent reproaches, giving reins to your rage, which I have not even by a word provoked, and to your lust for calumny, and so pouring forth the very "gall of bitterness" on a harmless individual. I pray God seriously, He may give you a better mind. To the matter in hand.

§ 2. I appeal to competent judges in this cause, men whose mercy I neither ask nor expect; I deprecate not justice, but injustice; nor am I so conscious of guilt, as to shrink from or fear the strictest examination of my doctrine, provided it be impartial. If what you affirm is true, if any where in my Dissertations, in utter shamelessness, I have spoken otherwise than honourably of the judgment of the English Church; still more if I have abused it: if I have proved myself an interpolator (in your sense) at all, still worse a most shameless one, of either Holy Scripture, or ecclesiastical doctrine; you have my full concurrence in your appeal which you make in the epilogue of your Dissertations to the reverend prelates of our Church, and in your entreaties to them, to rebuke me. Let this wretched book be cast into the flames as it deserves; let its author be deprived of his ministry (which he has now exercised nearly twenty years, and that by God's help with some little diligence): nay, let him be cast forth from the bosom of his dearest mother, (to whom in her worst misfortunes he has constantly clung,) as a bastard and as an alien, and let him be anathema. You see, reader, how great is my confidence in my own innocence; you shall judge presently if it be ill-founded.

§ 3. My Censurer accuses me of daring to disfigure the judgment of the Church of England, delivered in her eleventh article, with both ill-patched sophisms and unseemly reproaches, and of interpolating ecclesiastical doctrine, i. e. (according to

his meaning, not the proper sense of the word) corrupting and depraving it by additions. I will use one only argument in my defence, but that so clear and evident, that it will serve instead of many, and close the mouth of my Censurer for ever and ever, and all other my accusers of the same description.

Whoever openly, candidly, and sincerely embraces and professes, and ever has embraced and professed that sense of the eleventh article of the Church of England, which the English Church herself has avowedly and expressly handed down as the one genuine and true sense of the same articles, that man is wrongly, undeservedly, most undeservedly accused of distorting the judgment of the English Church in that article by ill-patched sophisms, or unseemly reproaches: but the author of a book entitled Harmonia Apostolica, &c., openly, candidly, and sincerely embraces and professes, and ever has embraced and professed that sense of the eleventh article of the English Church, which the English Church herself has avowedly and expressly handed down as the one genuine and true sense of the same article: therefore, &c.

§ 4. The major premiss is one of plainest truth. As regards the assumption, I must re-produce some few words, which I alleged before at the end of my Dissertations. The words of the eleventh article are these: "We are accounted righteous before God, only for the merit of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ by faith, and not for our own works or deservings: wherefore, that we are justified by faith only is a most wholesome doctrine, and very full of comfort, as is more largely expressed in the Homily of Justification." Here I have observed (p. 207) that out of the thirty-nine articles of the Church of England, thirty-eight are set forth barely, and without any explanation: while this one, on justification by faith only, has not been given without the express caution that we are to look for a more lengthened and fuller explanation of it in the Homily concerning Man's Justification: although therefore many learned and weighty men in our Church, have, perhaps with good reason, declared that the book of Homilies is not throughout of equal authority with our Articles, so that one is not at liberty to

STRIC. XXIII. open one's mouth or make the slightest murmur against any doctrine or interpretation of Scripture therein delivered: (because forsooth they were each composed at first severally by particular doctors, and were suited to the disposition of the people of that time, and in article thirty-five nothing more is determined of them than that they generally contain a godly and wholesome doctrine, and necessary for the times in which they were made:) yet no one can doubt but that the sense of the eleventh article must be fixed and explained exactly according to the Homily of Salvation, unless he choose to shut his eyes against the clear and express words of the article itself. Nay, this is still more clearly expressed (if this be possible) in the articles of Edward the Sixth. For in that edition of our Confession, (which was the first,) the whole of the article on the Justification of Man is contained in these few words: "Justification by faith alone in Jesus Christ, in the sense (N.B.) in which it is explained in the Homily on Justification, is a most sure and wholesome doctrine of Christians."

§ 5. This one thing then remains to be enquired into: viz. in what sense the doctrine of the eleventh article is explained in the Homily on the Justification or Salvation of Mankind. This explanation has been already cited by us in the epilogue of our Dissertation (p. 198), and is here afresh (on account of the obstinacy of the Censurer) repeated, and runs in these plain words. "The true understanding of this doctrine, 'We be justified freely by faith, without works,' or that 'we be justified by faith in Christ only,' is not that this our own act to believe in Christ, or this faith in Christ which is in us, doth justify us, and deserve our justification unto us, (for that were to account ourselves justified by some act or virtue that is within ourselves,) but the true understanding and meaning thereof is, that although we hear God's word and believe it, although we have faith, hope, charity, repentance, dread, and fear of God within us, and do never so many works thereunto; yet we must renounce the merit of all our said virtues of faith, hope, charity, and all other virtues, and good deeds, which we either have done, shall do, or can do, as things that be far too weak and insufficient and imperfect to deserve remission of our sins and our justification, and therefore we must trust only

in God's mercy and that sacrifice which our High Priest and Saviour, Christ Jesus, the Son of God, once offered for us on the cross, to obtain thereby God's grace and remission, as well of our Original sin in Baptism, as of all actual sins committed by us after our Baptism, if we truly repent, and turn unfeignedly to Him." STRIC. XXIII. Hom.p.23.

§ 6. In this explanation, two things at once occur to be observed. 1st. That the Church, by her doctrine that 'we are justified by faith in Christ only,' meant nothing else than that, as regards the meritorious cause of our justification, we ought to renounce all our virtues and good works, and trust in God's mercy alone, and the merits of our Saviour. 2ndly. That the Church so renounces the merits of good works in the matter of justification, as meanwhile plainly enough to assert the necessity of them for the obtaining of justification; while she acknowledges that a true and unfeigned repentance (which certainly is not only a good work itself, but embraces also many virtues and good works) is an indispensable condition for obtaining remission of sins, (which the author of the Homily, both in this exposition and continually elsewhere, holds to be equivalent to justification). Of this exposition moreover, it is twice declared that this is the true and right meaning of the article, 'we are justified by faith in Christ only.'

§ 7. But it must also be especially remarked, how the author of the Homily prefaces this exposition. "Although this doctrine be never so true, (as it is most true indeed,) that we be justified freely without all merit of our own good works, (as St. Paul doth express it,) and freely, by this lively and perfect faith in Christ only, (as the ancient authors used to speak,) yet this true doctrine must be also truly understood, and most plainly declared, lest carnal men should take occasion thereby to live carnally, after the appetite and will of the world, the flesh and the devil. And because no man should err by mistaking of this doctrine, I shall plainly and shortly so declare the right understanding of the same, that no man shall justly think that he may thereby take any occasion of carnal liberty," &c. Then follows, in as many words, the explanation already cited. In the third part of the Homily, in the beginning of what had been said before in Hom.p.22.

STRIC. XXIII. explanation of the article, we have this recapitulation. "You heard the ancient authors' minds of this saying, 'Faith in Christ only justifieth men,' so plainly declared, that you see that the very true meaning of this proposition or saying, 'We be justified by faith in Christ only,' (according to the meaning of the old ancient authors,) is this: We put our faith in Christ, that we be justified by Him only, that we be justified by God's free mercy, and the merits of our Saviour Christ only, and by no virtue or good works of our own that is in us, or that we can be able to have, or to do, for to deserve the same; Christ Himself only being the meritorious cause thereof. Here you perceive many words to be used to avoid contention in words with them that delight to brawl about words, and also to shew the true meaning, to avoid evil talking and misunderstanding," &c.; and therefore that man must be blinder than a mole who does not see that this exposition is put forth by our Church as the genuine, entire, clear, and perspicuous doctrine of the article, 'we are justified by faith in Christ only;' so that whoever embraces this, must be accounted so far to have satisfied her judgment and expectation. Moreover, in the words of the Homily quoted last by us, it must be especially noted that its author expressly declares that all questions and controversies which are or can be moved about the words and expressions of this article, provided there be agreement about the meaning of his exposition, are to be avoided, as idle, useless, and even harmful contentions in words.

Hom. p. 24.

§ 8. Now, how often both in my Dissertations and in the Examen, have I plainly avowed my agreement hereto, concerning the explanation of the article. I fear not to challenge your malice and more than Vatinian hatred, to sift thoroughly every word I have any where written, and to bring forward a single sentence or word which departs from the doctrine laid down in this exposition, even, as they say, a finger's breadth: and if you still have doubts as to my candour and sincerity, I would not refuse to clear myself (if necessary) by oath. Therefore, before God as my judge, whose anger I deprecate not, if I have knowingly deceived, I testify to all men, that I truly, sincerely and heartily agree and subscribe to the eleventh article of our Church, according

to the explanation she has herself given, (the words of which I take in their present usual signification, without any equivocation or mental reservation).

§ 9. What more would you ask of me? or do you demand that I am to fall down before, and embrace as oracles, all that certain particular doctors have added of their own explanation of this article, on account of their great names? You will never force me to do this, my Censurer. Your explanation however of this article, 'we are justified by faith in Christ only,' viz. that we are justified by faith alone as a single virtue, and that before all true contrition, before all obedience on our part, nay even before any readiness to obey: nor yet by any act of faith, but by that only which you call 'trust;' by this act of faith moreover, not as it is an act or virtue, or condition required in the Gospel covenant, but as an instrument whereby to lay hold on Christ's righteousness, and which makes it our own; making also His righteousness our own, not only in effect, i. e. as regards the saving fruits and effects of it, viz. the remission of our sins, and our acceptance to salvation and eternal life, but formally, so that that righteousness is made really ours, and we are accounted by God to have performed it, and hence are made perfectly righteous and free, not only from all punishment, but even from all fault of sin; so that in this justification, no place is left for remission of sins properly so called:—this, I say, your explanation, inasmuch as it is diametrically opposed to the interpretation of the article given by the Church herself, as also to Holy Scripture and right reason, I fairly and broadly avow, that I neither do, nor ever will admit; and I would venture to promise, if the votes of the more learned divines in our Church were taken one by one, you would scarcely, if even scarcely, find one in one hundred who would not laugh long at your follies, or rather bitterly lament them, and be indignant withal, that so gross Antinomianism should be thrust on the sons of the Church of England as her doctrine.

EPILOGUE.

EPIL. At length then, by God's help, I have despatched the Strictures of my Censurer on the principal points of my Dissertations. Every where have I dealt honestly: and though I do not deny that I have passed over very many things, yet I can solemnly avow, that I have done so because I really thought them to be of such a nature as either to require no answer, or if they did, to be such as had already been answered in what I had said in other points, either in the Harmony or in this answer. I trust, however, that in this little work I shall have been so far successful as that this book, which a malignant Censurer has loaded with so great odium, will hereafter shew itself to be, in all main points of the question at least, sound, Catholic, and orthodox, to every fair mind. But if I have erred in questions introduced by the way, or in explaining some of the more difficult passages of St. Paul, (which, though I do not remember to have been pointed out by my Censurer, yet from the dulness of my intellect, and the abstruse nature of the subject-matter, I can easily suppose,) I pray God the Father of mercies, in Jesus Christ our propitiation, that such weakness of mine be not laid to me as a sin, or become harmful to others. I will close this discussion in the words of a holy and learned man, which square more suitably with my littleness: "In St. Paul's Epistles, there is room for an elephant to sink; how much more a flea such as myself? Whence, in passages like this, I will eat as much as I can: what remains, I will burn with fire, following the exposition of the holy Catholic doctors, and contented with it. For no mortal man can penetrate the depth of the Epistles of St. Paul the Apostle."

AN

APOLOGY FOR THE HARMONY

AND ITS AUTHOR,

IN ANSWER TO THE

DECLAMATION OF THOMAS TULLY, D.D.,

IN A WORK LATELY PUBLISHED BY HIM,

AND ENTITLED

JUSTIFICATIO PAULINA.

BY

GEORGE BULL,

PRIEST IN THE ANGLICAN CHURCH,

AND AFTERWARDS LORD BISHOP OF ST. DAVID'S.

PREFACE.

§ 1. Having read through the work of the Reverend T. Tully, Doctor of Divinity, which he has entitled "Justification as taught by St. Paul," (*Justificatio Paulina,*) I confess I was completely overcome with astonishment. It is nearly five years since I heard, from persons whom I could trust, that he had undertaken and begun an answer to the tract called "Harmonia Apostolica." All of us therefore who had entertained a fair opinion of his learning, were expecting that from such an author, after so long an interval, some excellent work would at last come forth: or (if the barren and unfruitful cause which he had undertaken to defend would hardly allow of this) something certainly which might carry with it the appearance of a fair and full answer. Forsooth the lines of the poet had occurred to us—

> Could man's right hand have in Troy's cause prevailed
> Here was a hand for Troy that had not failed.

At any rate we were expecting from the well-known kindness and piety of the man a candid and courteous answer, and further, one which would throughout breathe a spirit of sincerity and Christian love.

§ 2. But every thing has turned out contrary to my expectation: for not one entire chapter or paragraph has the reverend gentleman gone through of a book which he wished to have the credit of having examined most accurately, and in which he therefore expressly informs his reader that nothing of any moment had knowingly been passed over by him: the only place in which he appears to have accomplished any thing of the kind, is in the argument concerning the meaning of St. Paul in the seventh chapter to the Romans, in which he answers the ninth chapter of my second Dissertation. And even how here he has really accomplished nothing will

PREF. plainly appear when we come to treat of that place. By far the greatest number of my arguments, and those of the greatest importance, he very prudently passes over in silence; and the answers which he makes to the very few he just lightly touches upon, I had already abundantly refuted; and yet he again brings forward these same, almost without any additional support. He himself uses arguments to which I had given sufficient satisfaction, keeping back from his reader in no fair way my solutions to them. He merely examines the digressions of my work, and, as if he were leaping about on the extremities of branches, he here and there catches at a few little points liable to his bite. Lastly, (and what is worst of all,) he puts words and opinions in my mouth just as he pleases, which are no where to be found in my work, and
larvis of which I never even dreamed, and with these phantoms he strenuously carries on the battle. He also miserably pares away and mutilates my words, which if they were given in their full sense would suffice for their own acquittal, and
tragœdias thence he gets up wonderful pathetic stories fastening upon me I know not what absurdities and heresies. If the Doctor's
strophis book teem not on all sides with such tricks as these, I am content to pass for a greater liar than a Cretan. Forsooth this is his way of thoroughly refuting the 'Harmonist,' as he calls him: by such artifices as these (which ill become a serious man, not to say a Doctor of Divinity) he gets up his illustrious triumph over his adversaries.

§ 3. But what, I ask, can you do with a book made up of fine words and empty pieces of rhetoric, of tragical sayings in no way belonging to the subject, of sophistry, sarcasms, and (to speak the truth) such manifest calumnies? For my own part, I remained long in doubt whether it would not be better to let the book go without any answer, until some pious and learned friends to whose judgment I owe much, suggested to me that there was need of some answer, lest in any point I might seem wanting to so excellent a cause, and that the book might not become a snare to the more simple and less educated, and do them injury by the deception of
lenociniis its sophistry, and its plausible language. They also added, that one ought to look to the credit and reputation of our most renowned theologians, and, further, of the much

revered prelates of our Church, since it requires no great wisdom to see that however unimportant a person I may be myself, they are wounded through my sides. For the reverend gentleman has taken occasion from my book (which it by no means afforded) to complain openly and before foreigners of the religion of our forefathers being innovated on by us, and that too by those who call themselves most devoted sons of the Church of England, and who are now occupants both of our press and pulpits: he complains also of noxious dogmas which are disseminated on all sides by these same men, and this not only with impunity, but even (as he very often and plainly insinuates) with the favour and approbation of their superiors. PREF.

§ 4. Thus spurred on, I immediately took up my pen to apologize not so much for the Harmonist (whom I could easily endure to see despised, abused, and trampled on by any one) as for the Fathers and most learned theologians of our Church, against whom the reverend gentleman has taken upon himself so free a licence of declaiming: and at the same time to expose, candidly, sincerely, and thoroughly, the real cause of all this ado. And if any where in this defence I am rather stringent, as is often the case, on the Doctor, this must be imputed to the indignity and atrocity of the matter, which could not be animadverted upon without satire. I hope, however, that by the grace of God I have so mastered my feelings, although justly roused, that nothing has escaped from my pen in the warmth and speed of writing, which may seem to have exceeded the limits either of the exact truth, or (all things duly weighed) of Christian meekness and humility, or in short, to use the words of casuistry, the moderation of a guarded innocence. However, that the reader may know what to expect in this answer, I may say that I have only followed the Doctor, step by step, up to the end of the fourth chapter; since in the four first chapters he may have appeared to some especially to have triumphed, and to have completely crushed the poor Harmonist, by the authority both of the ancient, our own, and the rest of the reformed Churches. And of those points which here and there in the other chapters, after having lengthily refuted or rather grumbled at, first Bellarmine and then Baxter, are directed

PREF. by him against the author of the Harmony, one meets with hardly any thing of consequence which has not been already abundantly refuted in the Examen. Wherefore, not to go over old ground, I shall leave those chapters untouched. I shall in the last place examine with greater accuracy the short Dissertation which he has added on the meaning of
censor St. Paul in Rom. 7, on which point our former critic had found no fault with us. With these few remarks by way of preface, let us (and may it be with good success) enter upon our Apology.

SECTION I.

ON THE TITLE OF THE BOOK.

§ 1. I begin with the title of the book. And here what do I hear? "The doctrine of justification as taught by St. Paul &c., maintained against recent innovators." An odious expression, with which he has taken care that his opponents should be branded in the very title-page of his book, so that he might by this method gain the hatred of those unacquainted with them, and might keep credulous persons, prejudiced by this imputation, from a true investigation of the matter: he speaks in the plural too, that all may know that this invective is not directed against me alone, but that very many others in our Church, of the same opinions as myself, are also censured. And that there might be no doubt concerning his meaning, he complains
p. 5. loudly and mournfully in his Preface, "That the Church of England, attacked on all sides, traduced in the streets, the pulpits, and the press, seemed as it were to be dragged behind a triumphal car;" and in the same place he says that
p. 76. he is speaking of what is well known. He elsewhere says that the truth which he defends is not only abused and laughed at by Socinians and Papists, but even by those "who perfidiously serving the interest of one or other of these parties, shamelessly take to themselves the title of Sons of the Church of England:" and he adds in the same passage, "that he speaks of what is the common theme every where in every pulpit and press."

§ 2. What foreigner is there who in reading these

words would not suppose that our English Church, once the glory of the reformed world, had been transformed into the common receptacle of Heretics, Papists, and Socinians, and that there had almost been a total defection of our divines from the faith and doctrine of the first reformers? SECT. I.

A more tragical appeal than this was never made nor could have been made even by the schismatical author of the "Apostacy of the Laudians." Meanwhile, what do the prelates of our Church? what, has some stupefaction come over them, that they take no pains, nay, no thought about stopping this apostacy? or, like those in the parable, are they so soundly, heavily, and with both ears asleep, that their enemies may scatter their tares on all sides securely and with impunity? In good truth they are. Yes, if we believe the Doctor, so far from opposing this growing evil, they even lend it a helping hand, and so wish the worst to those few (amongst whom surely Dr. Tully takes the lead) who are zealously contending against it. What other meaning, I ask, have these complaints, that the doctrine which he is about to defend "is in very ill repute," that "the fiercest hatred was displayed" against its upholders, that they must not expect any other reward than "sneers, hatred, and reproach?" Nay, when about to publish his work, he imagined terrible "lions in his way," to whose awfulness nothing was equal, save "the terror of the Lord, who in His own good time will confess those that confess Him, before His Father and His holy angels, and will deny those that deny Him." Any one unacquainted with our affairs would suppose that the Marian age was come again in England, in which freely to confess necessary truth was to earn the praise of a confessor, and even to affect the crown of martyrdom. On the other hand, Dr. Tully would not have his reader ignorant of the fact that those who refuse to take up with himself the arms of civil war against the Harmonists and the other innovators, pull too much with the stream, and that the Harmonist and his associates are acting a part.

p. 6.

ibid.

§ 3. But whence this clamour? whence these vociferations about the reformed religion of our ancestors being innovated on by us, with which both our own ears and those of foreigners ring again? I will explain in few words; I will

SECT. I.

give the reason candidly, and, as the subject requires, freely. In this controversy about justification, we are innovators, in the eyes of Dr. Tully and his friends, because we will not have thrust upon us those empty and inexplicable shifts and subtleties (to say no worse of them) with which they themselves have interpolated the eleventh article of our Church, whilst at the same time we heartily embrace that very sense of the article which alone our Church openly professed to have intended. Next, we are innovators because we prefer the consent of all antiquity to the single opinion of Calvin. We are innovators because we do not give the same place and respect to the canons of the Synod of Dordt as we do to the decrees of general Councils, received in the whole Christian world, of which canons (of Dordt) some of the most eminent prelates of our Church long ago freely and openly warned us[a] that they never had been approved or received in England by any public consent of the Church, and that they never ought to be: inasmuch as some of them are plainly repugnant to the clear definitions as well of our own Church as to those of other great reformed Churches: whence it follows that even before they were originated in that Synod, they had been condemned and rejected under the name of the Lambeth Articles, by Queen Elizabeth of glorious memory, and by those well-tried men, as the same prelates affirmed, who had been her counsellors in matters of religion. We are innovators because we are unwilling that that system of theology (which has been patched up by new teachers, and those foreigners too, who were by no means favourable either to the doctrine or discipline of our Church) should any longer have such a hold in our schools and Universities, that one is not permitted even to hint or whisper any thing against its definitions, theories, or conclusions; and that students in divinity should be taught that the basis of their studies was to be founded on it: and because we lay down that the writings of the ancient doctors approved by the Catholic Church, and specially of those who lived nearer to the time of the Apostles, should be diligently read, and received with proper reverence, by all. Lastly, we

vid. inf. sect. 7.

[a] See an Epistle of the Bishops, in the case of Montague, to the Duke of Buckingham; Heylin, Cypr. Anglican., p. 137.

SECT. I.

are innovators (for a strange reason indeed!) because, after the Sacred Scriptures, we regard and reverence early and pure antiquity, and advise others to follow its unanimous judgment wherever it can be found, (as it certainly can be in all points of greater moment,) whilst in other points each man's opinion should be left free, so he disturb not Christian charity and the Church, since we are persuaded that this is the best, nay, that this is the only way of putting an end to the unhappy controversies which at the present day have rent the Church of Christ into so many parties.

§ 4. This is their intention, this their fault whom this Doctor of Divinity has been pleased to stigmatize with the invidious name of innovators. A few words will suffice to shew how unworthy of a true son of the Church of England is it to brand any one with this reproach on such grounds. Every one who is not a mere novice in the history of our Church, must know that our Reformation was in all respects conformed to the example of the ancient Church Catholic, that is, so far as it was possible, and the age would allow: hence the order of Bishops was retained in England, that new form of ecclesiastical government being rejected which by the advice of Calvin had been established in neighbouring Churches. Hence forms of public prayer, rites, and ceremonies, all of them most ancient, have been religiously observed amongst us. Hence certain ancient doctrines, although greatly at variance with Calvin's tenets, such as universal propitiation through Christ our Saviour, defectibility of justifying faith (of which hereafter), of the eternal salvation of all infants born of Christian parents, and sealed by Holy Baptism, who may afterwards die without having committed actual sin, all these have been fixed and established amongst us: so that even from the original constitution of our reformed Church, her sons may learn how much deference they ought to pay to the judgment of the ancient Catholic Church. Hence too that Canon [b] concerning preachers, (which has been pointed out in the Examen,) almost in the earliest times of our Reformation, namely, in the year 1571, was sanctioned by the consent of a full provincial Synod, and afterwards ratified by the royal authority of Queen Elizabeth:

[b] Collect. Canon. Lond. edit. 1671. p. 238. (p. 19.)

SECT. I. "And above all, they shall take care that they preach nothing to be religiously held and believed by the people, except that which is agreeable to the doctrine of the Old and New Testament, and which the Catholic Fathers and Ancient Bishops have collected from that very doctrine."

Hence amongst the rules and directions which, by the advice of the Bishops, the wise King James the successor of Elizabeth recommended to the special care of the Vice-Chancellor, the Heads of Colleges and Halls, the two Professors, and the two Proctors in the University of Oxford, (when the Puritanical faction was more than usually strong there,) the following direction was inscribed: it is the seventh in order [c]. "That young Students in Divinity be directed to study such books as be most agreeable in doctrine and discipline to the Church of England, and excited to bestow their times in the Fathers, Councils, Schoolmen, Histories and Controversies, and not to insist too long upon Compendiums and Abreviatures, making them the grounds of their study in Divinity." If this most prudent advice had come into the Doctor's mind, he never would have put before the youth of our University (and unless I am much mistaken without a precedent) his Enchiridion of theological teaching, corresponding more nearly, as will be shewn in its proper place, to the tenets of Calvin, than to the doctrines of our own or the ancient Church.

§ 5. Hence the most eminent theologians of our Church have constantly and openly declared that they entirely embraced the consent of the ancient Fathers, and that they would never admit any thing, either in doctrine or ecclesiastical government, which was contrary to it. So the learned Saravia, whom we justly number amongst our divines, in the Preface to his Defence against Beza, says: "No innovations may be made contrary to the unanimous and constant consent of all the Fathers of the ancient Church, without the express command of God. For this I freely declare: whosoever takes away all authority from the Fathers, leaves none for himself." And again in the same Defence: "This, Beza, and as many as think with him, deny: and yet the Fathers understood it otherwise: to whose unanimous voice, God

cap. 7. p. 111.

[c] Vid. Heylin, Cypr. Anglic., p. 71, 72.

forbid that I should prefer the judgment of Beza, Calvin, or any of the new teachers, and should consider that they were wise but the Fathers not." So the great Jewel in his Apology says: "We have approached as near as ever we could to the Church of the Apostles and ancient Catholic Bishops &c.: and have not only modelled our doctrine but also the sacraments and form of public prayer after their rites and customs." SECT. I.

In like manner, the learned Bilson against the Puritans. "Be not unfair," he says; "we refuse none of those things which the primitive and ancient Church of Christ ever generally approved and adopted, as contained either openly or by implication in the Scriptures. No, this is your custom." So also the great Casaubon, acting as interpreter for our King and Church: "Our King," he says, "together with the Church of England, declares that he acknowledges that doctrine to be both true and necessary, which, flowing as in a channel from the fountain of holy writ, has come down to these times by means of the consent of the ancient Church." Elsewhere he says, "Unless I am much mistaken, the most wholesome part of the Reformation is in England, where, together with the love of truth, there flourishes the love of antiquity." De perpet. Eccles. Reg. cap. 15. [p. 409.] tacite Epist. ad Peron. p. 20. Epist. 709. (al. 837) ad Cl. Salmas.

But with much earnestness, as is his custom, the learned Montague in his Origines, writes, "Our new theologians who have lately come upon us, who perhaps are foolish, certainly are young, acknowledge this agreement and consent of all antiquity. But they are not moved by tradition. Much deference, say they, is to be paid to the veneration of ancient Churches and holy Fathers. All this is well. But why listen to their words when I see their actions? When I see the hoar hairs of antiquity not merely hooted at but assailed by mere boys, and men of no estate, wiseacres that think themselves wits? 'But we must obey God rather than men.' Very good, in case God commands one thing, and man another. But that is the question: they should prove, and not give sentence. Nay, there is no question. We hold firmly, against the whole faction of innovators, that from God, from God's word, mind, and will, the ancients did never depart. They say they did. Pooh! what is the authority of these innovators, that when they say so and συμφημισμὸν

SECT. I.

others deny it, we should agree with these rather than with those? When ever did the Spirit of the Lord go from the Church, to speak to those who stood against the Church?" With him agrees his most reverend successor in the See of Norwich, Joseph Hall. "Surely," he says, "whosoever willingly subscribes to the word of God, sealed in the everlasting monuments of Scripture, to all the ancient Creeds, to the four general Councils, to the common consent of the Fathers for six hundred years after Christ: (which we of the reformed Church religiously profess to do:) if he may err in small points, yet he cannot be an heretic." Let our great Hammond close the list of authorities[d]. "The Church of England," he says, "offers herself to the whole Christian world to be recognized by this mark, and by this to be justly estimated by posterity, namely, that in deciding on controversies of faith or practice she has always kept this point fixed and established, (and upon this basis she wished the British Reformation to rest,) that the first authority should be given to the Scriptures, and, after them, the second to the Bishops, Martyrs, and ecclesiastical writers of the first ages."

Concio ad Clerum 1623.

From all these passages it is clear (if indeed we must stand by the judgment of the greatest divines in our Church, and even of the Church itself) who they are who are to be accounted as really innovators, those namely who forge doctrines differing from the consent of our ancient Bishops, or who set to work to alter that form of government which has been every where received in the Catholic Church.

§ 6. Here then I take my stand: Let Dr. Tully, when he has searched through my Harmony from beginning to end, bring forward one single proposition which I have defended that is at variance with the decrees of the ancient Catholic Church, and I will instantly give myself up to him as conquered; without a moment's delay I will confess that he has most justly branded me with the name and infamy of an innovator, nor will I refuse openly and publicly to retract my error or heresy, whichever it be, and to sign my recantation before the whole Christian world: and I will then pay the penalty of rashness and heterodoxy (as they say Sulpitius did[e])

[d] Dissert. contra Blondel. proæm. cap. 14. sect. 13. [p. 50.]

[e] Gennad. in Catalog. Vir. Illust.

by the everlasting silence of my pen and tongue. God knows the secrets of my heart: I am so averse to any itching desire for innovation in theological doctrines, (however the Doctor of Divinity, usurping the tribunal of the Supreme Judge of all, may confidently impute it to me,) that whatever has been approved of by the consent of Catholic Fathers and Ancient Bishops, even though my poor intellect cannot see it, yet I embrace with all reverence: in truth, when as a young man I was writing the Harmony, I learnt from no small experience, (which now in more matured age I am most persuaded of,) that no one can oppose Catholic consent without his being in the end found to have opposed both the Divine oracles and sound reason, however much some passages in Holy Writ, imperfectly understood, and the appearances of shallow reasonings, may seem for a time to favour his cause. Daily with sighs and groans do I bewail that unbridled licence of preaching, which in our England (though not in our Church of England, as Dr. Tully complains) has been permitted for some years past from dire necessity, as it has been thought. But in a word, my sincere wish is, that the ancient customs and doctrines may prevail, *τὰ ἀρχαῖα ἔθη, δόγματα, κρατείτω*: nor do I abominate certain tenets of Dr. Tully from any other reason, more than that I am convinced they are thoroughly opposed to the unanimous opinion of the ancient Fathers.

SECT. I.

Just. Paul. p. 139.

§ 7. But since the Doctor is not ashamed, throughout his invective, to throw out against the supposed innovators those popular reproaches of Popery and Socinianism, (which after all are not very consistent, or likely to be found together,) I have thought it advisable to meet severally these two charges once for all. With regard to Popery, he calls us "rivals of the Papists, flatterers of the Jesuits, and that perfidiously serving their interests, we shamelessly take to ourselves the title of Sons of the Church of England." In short, through the whole of his eleventh chapter he is aiming at this alone, namely, to persuade his reader that our view of justification is not a finger's breadth different from that of the Papists, and even from those who maintain the merit of works in the matter of justification. But that you may perceive the full venom of his malignant and exasperated mind, listen to his

p. 4. p. 8. p. 76.

SECT. I.

own words. "Nor indeed are either the Papists wont to deny this, nor those adversaries who, as yet, had rather be known under another name." Who these are, differing only in name from the Papists, will be too plain to every one who reads his book, namely, not only his detested Harmonist, but very many of our divines occupying (and we have the Doctor's word for it) our churches, pulpits, and press, with whom he (the Harmonist) agrees. How atrociously does he calumniate all these by that single expression "as yet," so well do those somewhat skilled in forging calumnies know how to blast the fame of others even by a word. As if forsooth, those divines, who, up to this time, have been pleased to bear the name, and only the name of reformed, as soon as a convenient opportunity shall offer itself, were ready both to lay aside the name, and openly to pass over to the ranks of the Papists. But I beseech all who care for truth, piety, candour, and peace, that they do not believe the Doctor quite so easily. Let foreigners know (for no one at home, save a mere fanatic, would listen to these shameless charges) that there are and always have been amongst these divines whom Dr. Tully esteems as innovators, very many, who, in their most excellent published works, have strenuously and most successfully impugned papistical errors, nor have any triumphed more gloriously in this cause than some of these. I forbear from giving their names, that I may not hurt the modesty of as many as are still amongst us, or incur the ill-will of others. Nevertheless the champions of the Papal cause know and feel that what I say is true, to their cost. All who are good men, and fair judges of the matter, congratulate us, nor will a grateful and equitable posterity cease to acknowledge it. As far as I myself am concerned, who am the least of those divines who have been accounted worthy to suffer reproach for the free assertion of the Catholic Faith, and true doctrine of our Church, which we have freely asserted against certain new dogmas, with the assistance of the Lord I had rather die a hundred times than embrace the Creed propounded in the Council, or rather conspiracy, of Trent. Whatever Romish errors the Church of England has condemned either in her Articles or elsewhere, (I say not this at random, but advisedly,) the same do I equally con-

demn. As far as I have been able I have anxiously endeavoured to warn in time the more incautious of that small portion of the flock of Christ committed to my care, against the snares which the Romish emissaries have here and there craftily laid for our people, and even now do not cease to lay them. And I thank Almighty God that He has been pleased to make use of me, sinner that I am, as an instrument in extricating the souls of some from the depths and abysses of popish errors and superstitions. But what avails it to dwell longer on these points? Surely no sensible man would care for being thought a Papist by our Doctor, who ridicules and cries down the author of the Harmony as one who "lays his foundation in Rome," merely because he teaches "that true contrition necessarily precedes the justification of man," and affirms this to have been always the doctrine of the ancient Protestants. Forsooth in this controversy all are Papists in his eyes who are not Antinomians. SECT. I. Just. Paul. p. 32.

§ 8. Next, as regards Socinianism; I have solemnly declared again and again in my Examen that I altogether abhor that most destructive heresy. But the reiterated calumny of the Doctor compels me to explain my belief more at large, as it is opposed to the tenets of this most unhappy heresiarch. First then, there are two points in Theology in which it is but too plain that Socinus, to the great danger of himself and followers, has most widely departed from the path of Catholic doctrine, the one relating to the Person of Christ our Saviour, the other to the benefits we obtain by Him. Concerning the former, the wretched dogmatist teaches that Christ, whatsoever be His greatness, in His own nature was a mere man saving His conception in the womb of Mary by the ineffable overshadowing of the Holy Ghost, without any intercourse of man: that accordingly before He was born of the most blessed Virgin, He did not exist at all, which blasphemy I think deserving every kind of execration. That there is in Christ, besides His human nature, a divine nature, in which not only before Mary, but begotten of God His Father before all worlds, he had existed together with Him as His own True Son; and in which, by the will of His Father, He was the Creator of this Universe, that is, of heaven and earth and of all ψιλὸν ἄνθρωπον δημιουργὸς

SECT. I. that is therein, as well of things invisible as visible,—all this, both the sacred oracles so often and so clearly declare, and it has been always so unanimously believed of the Catholic Church from the very time of the Apostles, that I receive this article of the Divinity of our Saviour with the same degree of assent as I do Christianity itself, that is, (praise be to God) with the greatest. And that it may appear how entirely I abhor not only that of the Socinians, but every other heresy, and so am altogether a Catholic; I most heartily subscribe (God is my witness) to the Nicene Creed, which is, "In One God the Father Almighty, &c., and in one Lord Jesus Christ the only begotten Son of God, begotten of His Father before all worlds, God of God, Light of Light, very God of very God, begotten, not made, being of one substance with the Father, by Whom all things were made, Who for us men and for our salvation, came down from heaven and was incarnate," &c.

Moreover some years ago I drew out certain historico-ecclesiastical positions concerning the Divinity of the Son, in which I trust that I clearly shewed the agreement of the Ante-Nicene Fathers with the Nicene, as well concerning the "one substance" as "the co-eternity" of the Son, the tradition having been derived from the very time of the Apostles, as opposed to Petavius and others. But owing to ill health and the daily pressure of other cares and business, it has not as yet been in my power to put together my scattered sheets, and to finish my imperfect work.

τὸ ὁμοούσιον
τὸ συναΐδιον

§ 9. Concerning the benefits we enjoy through our Saviour, Socinus[f] denies that Christ has made satisfaction, or paid the penalty for our sins, or that He has undergone death in our stead. I, on the other hand, believe that it is perfectly

[f] Socin. Disput. de Jesu Christo Servat. par. ii. cap. 7. "I deny that Christ has paid any thing for us to the Divine Justice." And again: "I confess that Jesus Christ died on account of our iniquities and for our sins: but yet I firmly deny that it follows from that, that Christ Himself satisfied the Divine Justice in any sense for our sins, or paid that to it which we ought to have paid on account of our sins. For to die on account of or for any man's sins, is nothing else than to die through the cause or occasion of his sins. But he certainly dies through the cause or occasion of any's sins, who dies in order that a man be brought back from his sins, and that it be made sure to him that his sins will be forgiven him, if he shall depart from them, and moreover that he should really feel and obtain the fruit of the same pardon and so the pardon itself. But, that all this might happen unto us, Christ died."

clear, from innumerable and most explicit passages of Holy Writ, that Christ has not only died for our good, (which indeed the Heresiarch confesses, and which is true of any martyr,) but that He died also in our stead; that is, (to avoid any ambiguity of expression,) unless Christ had died, we, according to the Divine decree made against us, must necessarily have died: and since Christ has died, we shall not necessarily die eternally. But this being granted, namely, that had it not been for the death of Christ we must have died, then the solution or satisfaction is straightway obtained from the nature of the case itself (as the greatest vindicator[g] of the Catholic Faith on this point has most excellently observed). For either we should have been punished with death justly or unjustly: not unjustly, for we had deserved death, therefore justly—and if so, we were debtors unto death; from this debt Christ has freed us by giving something. But to give something so that another may be freed by that from debt, is to pay, or give satisfaction. Socinus[h] rigidly denies that Christ by the sacrifice of His Cross merited that God would grant us remission of our sins. Yea, he denies "that God on account of the outpouring blood of Christ promised us any thing." Forsooth, this is his constant teaching, that Christ died not for this, that He might obtain any promise for us from God, but only that He might assure us of the truth of the promises made by God, as if spontaneously and without any intervening propitiation. But I most firmly believe that Christ our Saviour as the true Son of God the Father, and greatly beloved by Him, by that stupendous emptying Himself of His glory in the assumption of human nature, and His death on the cross, obtained from God His Father, or worthily merited for us, that God would grant us those great gifts promised to us in the Gospel

SECT. I.

lib. i. cap. 3.

κένωσις

[g] Grot. de Satisfac. ix. p. 177. edit. Oxon. 1636.

[h] The same in ch. 26 of the same book: "Not only is the word *satisfaction* or *satisfying* no where found in Holy Scripture where it is treating of the salvation obtained for us by Christ, as you yourself confess, but nothing of the kind is even once found expressly written. Such as, that Christ by His death reconciled God to us; or that by dying He paid to the Divine Justice all the penalties due to our iniquities, or that by giving His blood as the price of our redemption He has delivered us out of the hands of Divine Justice: or that by His own obedience He compensated for our crimes; or that He worthily merited that God would grant us remission of our sins: or at least, lastly, that He has in any way appeased the anger of God for us."

SECT. I.

covenant, namely, remission of sins, eternal life, and, what is necessary for the obtaining both those benefits, the gift of the Holy Spirit, under the conditions laid down in that same covenant: and accordingly, that the whole most gracious covenant of the Gospel entirely rests, and is founded upon the obedience of Christ, of which His death and oblation of Himself on the cross were the completion, as its sole primary meritorious cause. The whole of this that Apostolical and almost inspired writer Clement, has expressed in a very few words in his Epistle to the Corinthians, (which passage I have often quoted in my Examen, and as often repeat, because I wish, as it were, to inculcate in the mind of the reader the true and real meaning of the satisfaction of Christ so clearly explained in it,) where he charges the believers that they should seriously consider, "How precious was the Blood of Christ in the sight of God, which being poured out for our salvation, obtained the grace of repentance for the whole world." Which words have this plain meaning; Of such value and so well pleasing to God the Father, was the obedience of His Son, even to the death of the cross, (for indeed it was composed of ineffable love to man, together with submission to God His Father: and moreover by that dispensation the glory of the Divine attributes, justice and mercy, shone forth in a wonderful, yea, a stupendous manner,) that for His sake He made a most gracious covenant with the whole human race, which was involved in the guilt of sin and under His wrath, and which He might justly have altogether destroyed with the apostate angels; by which covenant He undertook to give to all the remission of sins, and so eternal life under the condition of repentance, which comprehends the whole duty of fallen and sinful man returning to God. This is the true Apostolic and Catholic doctrine concerning the satisfaction of Christ, thoroughly opposed to the tenets of Socinus, and which, so help me God, I heartily embrace. But those vulgar opinions most unworthy of this very awful mystery, those senseless and pernicious doctrines, differing no less from Christianity than Socinianism, which some new divines have brought forward in this question, far be it that I should mix these up with the Catholic faith. I mean, their

προκαταρκτικῇ Θεόπνευστος

φιλανθρωπίᾳ

οἰκονομίᾳ

SECT. I.

opinions who teach either that God the Father was really angry with His Son ever most beloved by Him, even when He was offering Himself upon the cross for a "sweet smelling savour," or that Christ in His passion underwent the punishment and infernal torments of the damned; or that the Saviour of all offered Himself as a sacrifice only for the sins of a certain few; and that too, as they say, in their person, so that they themselves might be thought to have satisfied the Divine Justice, and be accounted through that satisfaction formally righteous, and free, in God's sight, not only from the guilt of sin, but actually from its commission: or (which is the consequence of this view) that these few, for whom alone the satisfaction of Christ avails, have been by it, *ipso facto*, liberated and so justified at the judgment-seat of God, before they were born; and that that justification which is attributed to faith in the Scriptures, ought to be understood merely of the justification in the judgment of conscience, or of the feeling and perception of justification which has taken place long before; or lastly, that the salutary fruits of the satisfaction of Christ, revealed to us in the Gospel by the will of God the Father, and of Christ, depend solely on the one condition of a single virtue, namely faith; which is clearly the opinion of our Doctor. They who have not only themselves built up upon this fundamental article of the Christian religion, such 'wood, hay, and straw,' together with the gold of Catholic doctrine, but have also obtruded on others, almost with anathemas, these additions, as if they were the very foundation itself, must look to themselves how they will hereafter give account at the judgment-seat of God.

εἰς ὀσμὴν εὐωδίας Eph. 5. 2.

§ 10. But our opponents urge, that at any rate in the controversy about justification the Harmonist is a Socinian and has openly passed over to the ranks of Socinus. I answer: This is plainly false, even from what I have already said. For there is this vast difference between Socinus and the Harmonist on the chief point of all, namely, the primary meritorious cause of our justification, which the Harmonist constantly teaches is to be found solely in the propitiatory sacrifice of Jesus Christ: while Socinus actually acknowledges none at all. But what need is there of many words?

SECT. I. This is the sum of my doctrine concerning the justification of man, (and if Dr. Tully can prove that I teach any thing beyond these two points, he has the victory,) that no one under the evangelical covenant which has been obtained and ratified by the meritorious outpouring of the Blood of Christ, can possibly obtain remission of sins, and justification, without faith and repentance; and that without the fruits of faith and repentance, no one can possibly keep and preserve their justification when obtained. Now if this be Socinian doctrine, (for I may here allude to the words with which Dr. Tully somewhere ridicules the Harmonist,) then the Fathers are Socinian, the Church of England is Socinian, all the more sound among the reformed are Socinian, the very Gospel itself is Socinian. Who then will be ashamed of this Socinianism, which is honoured with such patrons?

Just. Paul. p. 42.

§ 11. I have dwelt longer in ridding myself of this charge of Socinianism, both because it is by itself of great consequence, and because I have heard from many quarters that this report about me has been so widely spread by the artifices and industry of my enemies, that I am now almost every where taken for a Socinian. Indeed I speak from experience that this atrocious calumny has not only been detrimental to my family, but also (and what most vexes me) a great impediment to the success of my labours in the sacred ministry. May Almighty God of His most plenteous mercy give them grace to repent seriously and in time, for so foul an injury towards their brother, that they may escape that tremendous judgment which awaits slanderers in the world to come. Meanwhile I comfort myself with the blessing of my Lord God and Saviour Jesus Christ, Who said, "Blessed are ye when men shall revile you and persecute you and say all manner of evil against you falsely, for my sake. Rejoice and be exceeding glad, for great is your reward in heaven." So far then for the name of Innovators, under which Dr. Tully wished in the title of his book to crush his adversaries; the odium of which I have so removed, that I have omitted scarcely any thing in the whole book which has reference to it. I have done so with this design, that now a sensible reader may proceed, with his mind free from prejudices, and without any obstacle,

Mat. 5. 11, 12.

to the examination of those points which relate to the question itself. SECT. II.

SECTION II.

ON THE PREFACE OF THE BOOK.

§ 1. The thinking reader might conjecture from the Doctor's preface, what he was to expect as he proceeded in the book itself. Indeed, no sooner is he started, than he goes wide of the goal: for in the beginning of his work he attempts to set forth with a weighty apparatus of words, of what consequence in the judgment of the Prophets, of Christ, of the Apostles, Doctors, of all the Churches, new and old, is the controversy about the justification of the sinner, namely, whether it depends on the merits of men, or only of Christ our Saviour. But I ask, who amongst his opponents, whom he particularly attacks in this work, has ever denied this? Wherefore I pass over this very long piece of rhetoric as clearly irrelevant to the subject. ἀπροσδιόνυσον

§ 2. Then the reverend gentleman goes on to censure very severely those divines who thought they ought to abstain from the controversy which he himself is carrying on with so much zeal against the Harmonist and others, on the ground that it turned on a mere contest of words; that is, they said that they had no other opinion about it, than that which all the more sound men amongst Protestants held, though perhaps expressed in other words. These he ridicules as sluggish, sleepy, and downright Gallios, who cared not which way the chief points of Christian doctrine were defined so long as they themselves could enjoy their ease, and he ridicules and inveighs against them in these words: "I know not what torpor (in this sluggish age) has seized those also who perhaps make no contrary definition, that they should consider the most grand and important of all controversies as a mere useless contest of words, and thus take good care that it never deprive them of their sweet slumbers." That this certainly is a mere question of words, whether faith *which is fruitful*, or faith *in that it is fruitful*, qua justifies a man under the Gospel covenant, I have observed myself in the Harmony, Diss. I. vi. 2. p. 33, where also I have λογομαχίαν p. 3.

SECT. II.

shewn the consent of all sound Protestants on this point. Only I noted in the same place, that the common run of men had conceived most dangerous errors from the doctrine of justification having been explained in unappropriate terms by certain reformed divines whose opinions and views in other respects were sound and orthodox, which errors these divines in vain endeavoured afterwards to remedy by their minute distinctions and cautions. I praised that wise saying of the great Grotius on this point, "Incautious ways of speaking lead to pernicious consequences." Nor indeed is the Harmony taken up with these questions of words, its object and design being to reconcile the apparent difference of the two Apostles in a most important matter; and by far the largest part of it treats of the hard sayings of St. Paul, which the Apostle St. Peter of old complained were understood in bad and dangerous ways by the unlearned; and would that we in the present day had no just ground for the same complaint. If from this work, which, alas! is but too necessary, some contentious persons have taken occasion of generating empty questions of words and useless controversies, this is not to be imputed as my fault. But when Dr. Tully in the same place seriously warns those divines who seem to me to be prudent and moderate men, "that they do not account as nothing the great things of Divine truth," it is worth while to know what these great things are, for which he considers we should earnestly contend. Listen then attentively to the Doctor's subtile theology. We are justified, he says, by faith only, and that, not as a human work, although good, nor only as a condition laid down in the Gospel, but as an instrument, apprehending and applying the righteousness of Christ alone. We are justified indeed by faith, which is 'the hearty acceptation of Christ as our Lord and Saviour;' but beware lest you attribute justification to that part of faith which has reference to Christ as Lord; "But since the offices of Christ as Priest, and Lord, or King, although always the same and undivided in their subject, are yet formally separated by the intellect; it follows, that justification, which arises solely from the satisfaction of Christ, not from His dominion, and which in its formal conception is included not in the mortification of sin, but in its

λογομαχίαις ἐναντιοφανείας

δυσνοήτοις

magnalia

Just. Paul. p.112,113.

non-imputation, or the absolution of the sinner, must have for its primary or formal object Christ as Priest or Saviour. In the other conceptions of them, Christ, I confess, is the object of justification, as the 'which' or material, as Saviour alone and Priest, the formal or 'by which;' that is, (so that these scholastic distinctions may not hurt tender minds,) although Christ be alike Lord and Priest, and as a whole is received in justification, yet as a whole in every sense, i. e. looking at all His offices at once, He is not formally required for justification, but only in that He is Priest, and satisfying the law." Who in his senses is not indignant that these trivial distinctions should be bandied about as the great things of Divine truth, some of which you can scarcely, and hardly that, bring to a definite meaning, as when Christ is so often called 'the object of justification?' And yet this is nothing. Dr. Tully reverences as the great things of Divine truth some very pernicious doctrines, which are dreadful to Christian ears, and contends for these as for our very religion itself. Of this kind are, that man is justified, i. e. that his sins are remitted, and a right to salvation given him, before he repents and is really contrite; that a wicked man is justified in the conjunctive sense, i. e. whilst he still remains wicked; or that each man is wicked before justification, whatever be the account of it; that no virtue or work of man is requisite for justification, any more than for a man already born that he may be born. Certainly Dr. Tully takes good care that this controversy be not hereafter esteemed as a mere question of words, when he openly defends the very dregs of Antinomianism, as apostolical, Catholic doctrine, and the doctrine of all reformed Churches, and so confidently obtrudes them upon us.

SECT. II.

λεπτολογίαι

pp. 30—32, 102.

sensu composito p. 103.

p. 53.

γυμνῇ κεφαλῇ

§ 3. But who is not amazed at that truly tragic discourse which Dr. Tully, as if from a platform, thunders against the Harmonist and the rest of his adversaries, namely, that "justification badly understood, was that stone of scandal and rock of offence at which the Jews stumbled, because they sought for life amidst the sepulchres of works, justification not from the law of faith, but from works; that the controversy is confessedly not about limits, but about the entire possession; not for the walls, but for the palladium of

e suggesto p. 3, 4.

SECT. II. Christianity: where even from the least stumble (as with those walking on the ice) the greatest danger may arise: that there is no hope of obtaining salvation from God, if the one only way be unknown: lastly, when the sacred page points out to us two ways of being justified before God, the way of faith, and that of works, and puts these face to face, and so often and so openly puts aside whatever steers between the two, that to choose which path a man will take, is not a mere game of dice, but rather as it were the pledge and agreement for eternal life." Who, I say, is not wholly astounded at these words? Does Dr. Tully seriously believe that in the question of the justification of man, we agree with the Jews, that is, that we hope for righteousness and salvation from the law of Moses or from any of our own works, without Christ as our Mediator? Does he seriously believe that we have lost the whole possession of our faith, and the very palladium of Christianity; that we are ignorant of the only method of obtaining salvation, and, as he says, of the two ways of being justified before God, the one leading to life, the other to destruction; that we have chosen this latter as the pledge and agreement of our most miserable eternal fate? If so, may God have mercy on the man whom judgment or charity have so entirely deserted. Let the reverend gentleman know, that I know of no other method of obtaining justification and salvation beside this. I most firmly believe that if I yield a full assent to the Gospel of Christ, and if I truly repent through that faith, that is, by the grace of Christ cast off the yoke of all mortal sin, and seriously devote myself to the obedience of the Gospel law, that through the supreme mercy of God the Father, and through the sole merits of His Son my Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, Who for my sins, and the sins of the whole world, offered a true propitiatory Sacrifice to His Father, all my past sins, as many and as great as they may be, will be fully remitted. And I so trust that my sins are really remitted, and that I am already placed in a state of grace and salvation, as I am assured, from a serious examination of my conscience according to the rule of the Gospel, concerning my faith and repentance. I believe that as long as I bring forth worthy fruits of faith and repentance, that is, while I keep from those crimes which according to the

Gospel exclude a man from the kingdom of heaven, and earnestly practise good works, as well of piety towards God as of justice and love towards my neighbour, I shall preserve the grace of remission and justification I have received, and that at length, if I die in this state of righteousness, by the same mercy of God, through and for the sake of Christ, I shall attain eternal life and salvation. I believe that it is possible for me to fall, and after having received the Holy Spirit, as our Church says, to depart from grace, and therefore, according to the advice of the Apostle, 'I work out my own salvation with fear and trembling.' I believe that in the Gospel, pardon is promised to as many as have fallen, and as often as they do so, so that they only renew their repentance before their death and "do the first works;" but that to these same neither space of life nor grace, by which they may repent, is any where promised: and that so that saying of St. Augustine is most true, that "God does not give perseverance to some of His sons whom He has regenerated in Christ, and has given to them faith, hope and love." I believe that a certain extraordinary grace is given to some by the will of God: but I deem it to be the greatest madness for any one to presume on that grace, or to assure himself of any thing for certain, beyond the promises of God made to us in the Gospel. Lastly, I am most persuaded that throughout the whole course of my salvation, from the beginning even to the end of it, the grace and assistance of the Divine Spirit is necessary for me, and that I never have done, or can do, any spiritual good without Christ. And yet I do not hold up the necessity of grace as a veil for my own slothfulness, inasmuch as I know that that grace is not given except to those who pray unceasingly for it, nor its effect except to those who watch. Indeed our Lord Himself has joined these two things, watching and prayer, and so has taught us (as a very learned interpreter has observed) how fitly Divine assistance works together with human diligence. For he who is commanded to watch is not actuated as 'a moveable piece of wood with sinews not his own:' he who is to pray is shewn that he stands in need of Divine assistance, without which all human industry is vain. This is the way of obtaining salvation, on which, by the grace of God, I have entered, or certainly meant

SECT. II.

Phil. 2. 12.

Rev. 2. 5.

De Corrept. et Grat. cap. 8. [§ 18. vol. x. p. 759.]

προσοχὴν, καὶ προσευχήν

Mat. 26. 41. Lu. 21. 36.

SECT. II.

to enter; and which I chose, both because this is clearly shewn to me in the Holy Scripture, and because it is a trodden and safe way, which all Catholic Christians for at least fifteen hundred years from the birth of our Saviour have trodden before. If Dr. Tully knows of another, let him follow it at his own peril, if he has so determined with himself, which I hope he has not: he certainly will not have me as a companion.

§ 4. I know not indeed with what sincerity Dr. Tully declares that he has unwillingly entered the lists of this con-
p. 5. troversy. What, does he enter unwillingly, who without being called, ay, and against the consent of the governors of the Church, to whose judgment he ought to have submitted, has intruded and thrust himself into the controversy: who after having been rejected three times by those who had the care of the press, (I say what I know to be the fact,) at last has obtained permission to print somewhat secretly, and by no very praiseworthy artifice? But forsooth the incitements of so great a cause have urged him on. In the first place, what contumely is it against those heads of our Church who have not only favoured so great a cause, but have exercised their authority against it? And then if zeal only for a great cause, and as he presently expresses himself, the avenging of sacred truth has dragged him into this contest, why did he refuse an amicable conference by writing, which I myself offered him? For the reader may know that when I was once speaking with the Doctor, concerning his work against me, which was then, as he expresses it, just in the birth, I most earnestly implored him to have a regard for the peace of the Church, and to be very careful that from the public disagreement of two divines of the same Church, no occasion should be given either of slander to schismatics and enemies of our Church, or of stumbling to the weak: and moreover, I entreated him that he would communicate his papers to me in a friendly manner, under this condition, that if he could prove in them, that I had written any thing contrary to sound doctrine, I would not refuse publicly to retract my error: he answered, that "he would send me, perhaps in a short time, a copy of his papers." Dr. Tully knows that I speak the truth, and that I also have as a witness to the fact a divine of well-known

trustworthiness, who was present at our conversation. But I was never permitted to see these papers, till they became, by means of the press, public property, and were exposed to the eyes of all men. SECT. II.

§ 5. The reverend gentleman at the close of his Preface seriously exhorts his opponents with these words. "This much, I beseech and implore the supporters of the opposite cause, that if they are meditating an answer, they do it with such candour, sobriety, and reverence for Christian peace, that we may hold different opinions, if not with safety to the cause of truth, at any rate with our friendship unbroken." Good sentiments indeed! and would that he himself had observed the law he lays down for others. But how can he have a love for candour, who has decked out his answer to his adversary's work with such artifices as I have mentioned above, so opposed to all straightforwardness? Where is his sobriety, reverence for Christian peace, desire of preserving friendship safe and sound with those who differ from him, when he every where describes those of different opinions to himself as sophists, innovators, deserters of the doctrine of the Church of England, notwithstanding the repetition of their oaths and subscriptions; as rivals of the Papists, fawners upon the Jesuits; as men perfidiously serving the interests of Papists, or Socinians, under the false name of Sons of the Church of England; as temporizers, and such like? Surely it is but a meagre excuse which he gives for the intemperance of his pen, when he says, "Truth, I confess, may sometimes demand vehemence of style, but never fury;" as if all vehemence of style which keeps itself within furiousness were to be esteemed sobriety. If it *be* so, I bid the reverend gentleman be quite easy as to the sobriety to be observed by the supporters of the opposite cause, since there is nothing in his book to drive any of his opponents into furiousness. p. 6. p. 5.

SECTION III.

ON THE FIRST CHAPTER—STATE OF THE QUESTION.

§ 1. Dr. Tully seems to have been desirous of shewing, in defining the state of the question how "accustomed he

SECT. III.

was to splitting hairs in controversy," the skilfulness in that art he had pretty evidently assumed to himself in his Preface. But here the reverend gentleman exalts himself in a wonderful way, and looks down, as it were from a lofty eminence, upon his adversaries. For he ridicules them as "Sophists," and deluded bits of men "fighting with shadows," and says that the "state of the question had been miserably confused by them;" but "he himself promises to
p. 8. explain it briefly, simply, and clearly." And not content with this, when about to close the chapter, he bids his reader if "he would not wander in the clouds, keep in mind" his explanation of the state of the question, as he will then easily perceive "what light straws of petty reasonings" are held out by his adversaries, "instead of solid arguments." Come then, let us see if he can produce any thing answerable to such ostentations, and such magnificent promises.

ibid. § 2. "In the first place," he says, "we lay down that there never was any controversy in the reformed Churches, either amongst themselves, or with others, whether faith which justifies be barren or unfruitful, and bereft of good works, as opportunity offers; such a faith all dismiss from the work of justification," &c. If this be true, let him see in what way he can reconcile his doctrine with the common opinion of all reformers. For according to his theology, justifying faith, when it justifies, is quite a barren thing, without any good work or virtue; inasmuch as it justifies before any sanctification of the heart, and so before true contrition for sin, whilst a man is still wicked and destitute of every good work. But how can he dismiss from the work of justification, a faith bereft of good works, when he attributes justification to faith, before every good work even internal? In vain does he proclaim that saying of some divines, "Faith pregnant with good works justifies before the birth," since that clever apothegm has been amply refuted by us in another place. Besides, one cannot conceive
Harm. Diss. I. vi. 2. p. 33. how, in any intelligible way, a man can be really wicked before justification, and destitute of every good quality, as Dr. Tully asserts, who in any intelligible way possesses a faith pregnant with good works, before justification.

§ 3. He proceeds: "Nor, secondly, is it made a question,

SECT. III.

whether, together with justifying faith, the radical seeds, or (if you had rather) the habit of the other virtues be implanted; for this is granted on both sides." Again, I do not see how the Doctor's theology is consistent. For, if together with the habit of justifying faith, the habit of the other virtues be implanted, it follows that this implanting of the habits of the other virtues must precede justification, for Dr. Tully confesses that justifying faith precedes justification, and indeed it is self-evident. Elsewhere the reverend gentleman eagerly contends that sanctification, which he makes to consist in the implanting of those habits, is altogether posterior to justification, and (as we have seen) that a man at the very moment of his justification is entirely wicked. Dr. Tully might say, perhaps, (which indeed he does say,) that the implanting of the habit of faith is altogether, in order of nature, prior to justification, and that the implanting of the other habits of virtue is posterior to it: but yet that these three works of Divine grace, namely the implanting the habit of faith, justification, and then the implanting the habits of the other virtues, are contemporaneous, and, as they say, are effected in one and the same moment. Wonderful acuteness! But I answer, 1st, if we were to allow that any such instantaneous infusion of the virtues were to be found, that would not lessen the difficulty. For since our adversaries confess that a man is not justified by the mere habit of faith, but by some act of faith (whatever that may be) proceeding from that habit, it follows that some interval of time must come between the implanting of the habit of faith and the justification of man, in which this justifying act of faith may be performed; whence any one may see that if the habit of justifying faith and of the other virtues be implanted at the same time, the implanting of the other virtues cannot possibly be in any way, either in time or nature, posterior to justification. But 2ndly, to state the matter plainly, I consider that this widely-spread doctrine of the simple and instantaneous infusion of all the Christian virtues at once into the soul of man, whether it be before or after justification, is very erroneous, and moreover is the fountain and spring of other important errors in theology.

Enchir. Didact. cap. 10.

May I then, with the reader's permission, explain briefly, by

SECT. III. the way, one most useful, and in many points, most necessary truth.

§ 4. And first we must lay down this as a foundation, that Christian virtues are habits, neither simply infused nor simply acquired, but mixed, that is, partly infused, partly acquired. To explain myself: these virtues are not habits simply acquired, because they are by no means acquired through any previous acts on our part, without the grant of the grace of God, and assistance of the Holy Spirit. Nor are they habits simply infused, for this unassailable reason; that which is simply infused, it were in vain and even absurd to impose upon us as a duty, or condition, necessary for obtaining salvation. (For why is that enjoined upon us by God, which God Himself alone creates in us?) But these virtues are so imposed upon us, and not in vain, therefore they are not simply infused: what then? I should call these virtues (in the words of a most learned man) certain acts of ours which are excited and brought out by grace, preventing, calling forth, assisting, accompanying and subsequent upon them, but in such a way that the frequent and continual performance of these acts at length generates in the soul certain habits, by which we have the will and ability to perform the acts themselves easily, willingly, and constantly. For in supernatural things it must be granted that the moving principle of the acts themselves is a supernatural cause, which need not be in things natural. And this being granted, the entire necessity, dignity, and efficacy of Divine grace can be kept entire together with created nature itself, which still exists under sin. For we must look upon grace in such a light as not to do away with the whole created nature of the subject on which it acts, which must of necessity follow, when it is taken for granted that such an infusion and influx of the implanted habit passes immediately on into action. With this then laid down as the foundation of our argument, it will not be difficult to explain intelligibly (as far as human weakness can do so) the reason, order, οἰκονομίας and as it were, method of the whole dispensation by which, through the grace of the Holy Spirit, saving virtues are generated in our souls, and our salvation is procured. Certain acts or dispositions (as they are called) necessarily

precede the justification of man, by which a man is rendered fit and able to receive so great a blessing from God: such are, sorrow for sin, hatred of sin, humble submission to God, flying to God's mercy, placing our hope in Christ our Mediator, the desire of the Divine favour; before all things, a steadfast purpose of leading a new life, and the like; all of which are comprehended in Holy Writ under the two words, Faith, and Repentance. These acts however, or dispositions, by no means proceed from the mere strength of a man's will; but are altogether produced by the Holy Spirit, preventing, exciting, assisting, accompanying (though not as yet dwelling in) a man. They are nevertheless produced in the man and by him through the grace of God, not in an instant, which is impossible, (since it is of itself manifest, that for a man to produce all these acts, there is need of time, and as it were a series of pious reflections,) neither necessarily, or as they say, irresistibly: but gradually, and in such a measure as a man obeys the leading of the Divine Word and Spirit. To a man thus through grace disposed, that greatest of blessings, justification, is given through the great mercy of God, and by and for the sake of Christ; his sins, however many or great they may be, are fully forgiven, and a right to eternal salvation is granted him: and then upon the man now justified, and so presented with the privilege of adoption, "the Spirit of adoption" is sent forth to be as it were a sign of love and the seal of his adoption. This gift of the Spirit which follows justification, differs in two ways from the grace of the same Spirit, which prevents and effects the conversion of a man: first, because the Holy Spirit is united more closely and nearly than before to the soul now purged of its vices, penetrates more deeply into it, and pervades more fully all its faculties. Whence in the Scriptures the Holy Spirit is said, before a man's conversion, to knock as it were at the door of the heart: but after conversion, to enter the inmost parts of the house. Secondly, because that most Holy Spirit now dwells in, and as it were fixes His seat in the soul, which before He had only visited, and prepared by His preventing grace for a habitation for Himself, never to depart thence unless driven out by some grievous sin; and even should that ever happen, ready willingly to return if

SECT. III.

υἱοθεσίας Gal. 4. 6.

Rev. 3. 20.

SECT. III.

only recalled by serious and timely repentance. These are not the dreams of innovators, but the truth itself most clearly handed down to us in the Holy Scriptures, which as they every where and in most clear expressions place the gift of the Holy Spirit after faith and repentance, and teach that the Holy Spirit is not infused except into souls already well prepared and disposed, so do they attribute faith as well as repentance, in terms equally clear, to Divine grace. I beg my reader to read, not superficially, but with attentive and serious examination, the following passages of Scripture:— Prov. 1. 23; Isa. 57. 15, and 66. 1, 2; Luke 11. 9, 13; John 14. 17—23; Acts 2. 38, and 5. 32; Gal. 3. 14; Eph. 1. 13; 1 Pet. 5. 5; Rev. 3. 20; compared with John 6. 44; Acts 16. 14; Eph. 2. 8; 2 Tim. 2. 25.

This gift however of the Holy Spirit, which is posterior to faith, repentance, and even to justification, does not create (and this is of great consequence) new habits of virtue in a man, but only confirms, strengthens, invigorates, increases, and at length improves into solid habits, those more imperfect dispositions to virtue which had been before produced by means of preventing grace, and which we said were comprised under the names of Faith and Repentance. For true repentance (inasmuch as it includes the fear of God, love to God, though somewhat imperfect, hatred of sin, love of righteousness, &c.) has in it the seeds of all virtues, which afterwards, being more richly watered on by the grace of the Holy Spirit, grow up into the harvest of virtue and good works; whence all good works which come from a man already justified are spoken of in Holy Writ as "worthy fruits," "works meet for repentance." But since the Holy Spirit increases in various ways (of which it belongs not here to speak) those previous good dispositions in the justified man: yet amongst those ways, this seems to be conspicuous, (to use the words of a very learned man,) that efficacious and powerful impression of the Divine favour on the mind, by which the hearts of the faithful, already imbued with the hopes of everlasting life which they have gained from the words of the covenant, are oftentimes so mercifully and sweetly affected and possessed with a surer sense of this hope, as if they already tasted and perceived in some way the powers of the world to come, and in

ἄξιοι καρποὶ, ἄξια ἔργα τῆς μετανοίας. Mat. 3. 8. Acts 26. 20.

some degree were enjoying their promised reward. Our love to God is wonderfully kindled by this sense of His Divine favour: and to love, especially ardent love, nothing in virtue is difficult. These things are plain and easy, as far as the sublimity of the subject allows: but as to Dr. Tully's philosophizings about the simple and instantaneous infusion of all the virtues at once, neither he nor any one else will ever be able to explain them intelligibly. But to return from our digression.

§ 5. Dr. Tully proceeds: "And in the third place," he says, "we will not moot the controversy whether good works are necessary to salvation, so long as they are in their proper place, and on their true foundation," &c. But why has he not here (which was the right place) explained this measure, place, order, and foundation, according to which he confesses that good works are really necessary to salvation? Surely because he could not, with safety to his own hypothesis. For those elegant similes and metaphors which he so greatly delights in, plainly have nothing to do with the subject. "For building a house," he says, "the assistance of each labourer is necessary, but not so necessary as that of the architect." "There is need of the handmaid in the house, who however, if she insolently act as mistress of the house, must be driven out with Hagar." Just as if any of us had dared to assign the architect's plan in building the house of our salvation, or that of mistress of a family in ordering the arrangements in the same work, to our good works and not to Divine grace and the merits of Christ. It is grievous to have to refute so often such a manifest calumny: it will satisfy us, if Dr. Tully shall acknowledge, without deceit or false colour, *any* true use of good works necessary for obtaining salvation, (be it such as that of a handmaid serving the mistress of the family in the house,) and does not esteem true holiness as Hagar, and altogether cast it out. But, I ask, what kind of necessity of good works does he acknowledge who does not hesitate to grant to a man who only believes, before every good work, even internal, the right to salvation, and that too irrevocable? Does he say that good works are necessary only as signs of true and saving faith? But this necessity has respect to men, not to God, Whose

SECT. III.

omniscience does not stand in need of these signs and proofs. Or does he call them the necessary effects of true faith? But Dr. Tully will do a great thing and worthy of himself if he will tell us of any faith, which is merely faith, and which does not include love in its notion, whence good works necessarily spring. I know full well that he cannot do this. But I wish, all prejudice and pride being laid aside, that the reverend gentleman would read the full explanation of faith as I have given it in my Examen; or if he despises my writings, let him consult the illustrious Hammond, (and there is no disgrace in applying to such a master,) in his posthumous tract on the Agreement of St. James and St. Paul, annexed to another on the Eternity of Hell Torments, which is almost entirely taken up in refuting this error.

Answ. to Strict. XIII.

§ 6. Dr. Tully goes on. "Nor fourthly, is there any controversy whether in a declaratory sense a man's justification is to be attributed to his good works, whether in his own heart and at the tribunal of conscience, or abroad before others; for a tree is known by its fruits." Excellent advice indeed! as if forsooth any one in his senses would suspect that in the question of the declaratory justification of a man, (as it is called,) whether at the tribunal of conscience or before others, was the real issue of the controversy between the Doctor and his opponents. Meanwhile I am ignorant how Dr. Tully can take it for granted that a man is justified abroad before men, that is declared just by his good works. Certainly no good works of ours meet the senses of other men, besides external ones, but these a hypocrite, most removed from justifying faith, can do equally as well as a true Christian; which is so true that the Apostle plainly teaches us that a man may perform outwardly the most heroic works, as giving all his goods to the poor, and undergoing martyrdom for Divine truth, who is plainly destitute of true love, and so of justifying faith. For the answer that Dr. Tully in another place makes to this, that the tribunal of man is fallible, and that men can justify the wicked and condemn the innocent, but that civil tribunals do the same, and yet do not cease to be tribunals, as this proves a fault in the judges, but takes not away the jurisdiction of the court—this, I say, is of no weight. For neither is it the fault of the

τὸ κρινόμενον

1 Cor. 13. 3.

Just. Paul. p. 148, 149.

judges that men do not judge surely concerning the goodness of others, but the cause is the want of a standard by which they might judge surely in this matter. For, in fact, it is but some miserable little man thrusting himself into another's tribunal and daring to pass sentence concerning another man's conscience, which is subject only to the knowledge of God. We may indeed hope well of the internal goodness of another, but this is not to pass sentence. SECT. III. See 1 Cor. 4. 3—5.

§ 7. Dr. Tully at length prepares himself to explain the very issue of the controversy. "This then," he says, "is the point in debate, or true state of the question, (as it is defended by the reformed Churches,) namely, what that is, at the sight of which, or for the sake of which, God receives into a state of grace sinful man, a child of wrath, who is under the curse of the law, absolves him from that curse, and then makes him an heir of everlasting life. And indeed on God's part it seems agreed that it is the merits of Christ alone, in which the Father is well pleased. The difference of opinion arises from the application of these merits, namely, what that is, which, by application, makes this inestimable treasure ours. Our opponents at home say, with the Papists, that it is 'faith and works,' we, 'faith only,' and that not as a work of man, although it be good, but as apprehending, sealing to ourselves, and applying the righteousness of Christ alone," &c. τὸ κρινόμενον

There are many points here deserving answer: but I will take notice of three only. 1. The Doctor's expression, 'seems to be agreed,' concerning the merits of Christ alone, is bad. Away with this word of uncertainty. It not only 'seems' but it is 'certain,' that we admit nothing of ours as meritorious in the work of justification and salvation. 2. With his usual candour he joins as it were in wedlock his opponents at home with the Papists: though he knows well enough that the parties are not as yet agreed. 3. With regard to the question itself, excellently indeed, and in a manner quite becoming a Doctor of a University, does he explain the point at issue, or true state of the question, in figurative or metaphorical and so uncertain expressions. Thanks be to God we are not ignorant what this 'inestimable treasure' is: τὸ κρινόμενον

SECT. III. but we are in doubt how it is applied, namely, whether by that 'apprehending, sealing, applying,' he means the requisite condition on our part. If so, we firmly assert that the single virtue of faith is not the only condition laid down for us in the Gospel for obtaining remission or justification, but that repentance is requisite for that in addition; and we may wait in vain for the reverend gentleman to give any solid answer to the arguments with which we support this assertion. But if he means any thing else, deeper than this, would that he had leisure to explain intelligibly to us so great a mystery. Thus far we have heard Dr. Tully. But I appeal to the conscience of the reader whether he has profited one jot from this laboured explanation of the question. Let us see whether something more definite and clearer may be drawn from these innovators.

προηγουμένη § 8. Not to say any thing of the leading cause of our justification, (for all Christians allow that to be the mercy of God,) reformers are agreed concerning its formal cause, namely, that it consists in the remission of sins, and acceptation of a man to eternal salvation. So the Augsburg Confession in the article on faith, having brought forward very many passages of St. Paul in which he speaks of the justification of man, subjoins: "Justification in these passages of St. Paul means, remission of sins, or reconciliation, or imputation of righteousness, that is, acceptation of the person."

[p.17.Oxf. ed. 1840.] In like manner our Church in the Homily on Salvation, part the first, almost in the very beginning: where after it has stated that no one in the sight of God is perfectly righteous and quite free from sin, adds: "Therefore every man of necessity is constrained to seek for another righteousness or justification to be received at God's own hands, that is to say, the forgiveness of his sins and trespasses in such things as he hath offended." It explains it more fully afterwards, where it thus describes the justification of infants sealed in Baptism, and dying before the commission of actual sin: that "washed from sin" (i. e. original) "by the sacrifice of Christ, they are brought to God's favour, and are made His children, and inheritors of His kingdom of heaven." There are indeed some divines amongst the reformed who make the formal cause of justification consist in the remission of

sins alone; but their meaning, as explained by themselves, differs only in word, and not essentially from the former. For they say that the remission of all sins requires that to whomsoever God, according to the Gospel covenant, remits sins, he should at once be considered righteous, and worthy of the reward of righteousness, that is, eternal life. For (say they) since sins are partly of commission, when some command of prohibition is violated, partly of omission, when a positive command is neglected, he who has his sins of either sort remitted, is considered perfectly righteous, and so worthy of his reward. They add, that full remission is of all punishment, as well of loss as of sense: and therefore, whosoever obtains full remission, has restored to him the right to the eternal kingdom which he had forfeited through sin: so that here there is but a question of words. Refer, however, to our explanation of the true notion of justification in the Examen, answers to Stricture III. and IV.

SECT III.

λογομαχία

§ 9. Secondly, all the reformed are agreed (for with justice we erase Socinians from the list) about the primary meritorious cause of our justification, that it is only to be sought in the satisfaction of Christ our Lord.

προκαταρκτικῇ

§ 10. Thirdly, it is agreed upon amongst the more sound of the reformed divines, that Christ has not, by His own satisfaction, obtained remission of sins, and a right to eternal salvation for us 'absolutely,' but under 'a certain condition' laid down in the new covenant: and so that no one is justified 'immediately' by the satisfaction of Christ, but those only who shall have performed this condition. Certainly one and all of the confessions of the reformed Churches agree on this point. There have not been wanting, I know full well, certain schismatical pretenders to theology amongst us (at whose head was that Crisp whom I have mentioned elsewhere) who have dared openly to teach that all the elect, immediately from the death of Christ and even from eternity, inasmuch as the death of Christ was seen in the Divine decree as accomplished, have been absolved from the guilt of their sins; and that that justification which takes place in time, and is so often mentioned in the Scriptures, is nothing else but a certain joyful sense or perception of justification before accomplished and finished. But it is now a long time since these

SECT. III. dregs of men with their mad doctrines have been exploded from amongst us.

§ 11. The whole controversy therefore is concerning the indispensable cause, or *sine qua non*, or condition on our part, which is requisite for justification. In short this is really the point to be decided; on this the question turns; "Under what conditions the remission of sins and the right to eternal salvation are promised to us in the Gospel covenant?" Dr. Tully says, under the condition of faith alone, as a single virtue; we, in agreement with the Prophets, with Christ, His Apostles, with all the doctors of the ancient Church Catholic, with the Fathers of our own Church, with the more sound of the reformed divines, constantly assert that it is under the condition of faith and repentance. In a word, the sum of our doctrine, as I have said, is this: In the Gospel covenant, procured and ratified by the meritorious satisfaction of Christ our Saviour, remission of sins and a right to eternal salvation is obtained on our part by faith and repentance, and these privileges are preserved by the fruits of faith and repentance. Whoever shall attend to this explanation of the question, will, I have no doubt, wonder how, in so plain, easy, and clear a matter, any controversy, not to say one so bitter, could have arisen amongst divines of strong judgment, and lovers of peace and truth.

τὸ κρινόμενον

§ 12. And now, in a few words to bring the sum of this argument to a point, and place before the reader the whole controversy, as it were, at one view; our conclusion to be proved against the Doctor is this; that besides faith, true repentance is also required by the Gospel as altogether necessary for any one to obtain remission of sins and a right to eternal life. To support this position we do not heap together, as Dr. Tully supposes, frivolous straws of reasonings from the sacred page badly understood, but we make use of most plain passages of Scripture, which hardly need any deduction of consequences. In truth, the whole Bible, from beginning to end, is full of proofs which most clearly shew the necessity of true repentance for obtaining remission of sins or justification. From so great a number it will be sufficient to give some of the most remarkable: the voice of the Gospel sounding through the Gospel Prophet is, "Wash

Is. 1. 16—18.

you, make you clean; put away the evil of your doings from before Mine eyes; cease to do evil; learn to do well, &c.; Come now and let us reason together, saith the Lord; though your sins be as scarlet they shall be as white as snow: though they be red like crimson, they shall be as wool." Where the promise of remission annexed to the command of repentance shews how great is the necessity and efficacy of the one to obtain the other. But what can be imagined plainer than the following? "But if the wicked will turn from all his sins that he hath committed, and keep My statutes, and do that which is lawful and right, he shall surely live, he shall not die. All his transgressions that he hath committed, they shall not be mentioned unto him: in his righteousness that he hath done he shall live. Have I any pleasure at all that the wicked should die? saith the Lord God, and not that he should return from his ways and live?" And again, "Repent and turn yourselves from all your transgressions, so iniquity shall not be your ruin," &c. To these may be added Ezek. 33. 11—16. In the New Testament it is said John Baptist was sent by God "to preach the baptism of repentance for remission of sins," where the end, and means conducing to it, are put together: the end, remission of sins, or justification; the means, Baptism and repentance. He therefore who teaches that man's sins are remitted before he truly repents, puts the end in execution before the existence of the means; than which nothing can be more absurd. Hence the Lord Jesus said to His disciples "that repentance and remission of sins should be preached in His name." Having this in his mind, St. Peter preached to the Jews in this way; "Repent, and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins:" also, "Repent therefore, and be converted, that your sins may be blotted out," &c.: so also to Simon Magus, "Repent therefore of this thy wickedness, and pray God, if perhaps the thought of thine heart may be forgiven thee." Lastly, the Apostle St. John, "If we confess our sins, He is faithful and just to forgive us our sins, and to cleanse us from all unrighteousness." Where by synecdoche all interpreters are agreed that in the word 'confession,' the whole of repentance is included, and the Apostle saith as much in ver. 7.

SECT. V.

Ezek. 18. 21—23.

ver. 30,31.

Mark 1. 4.

Lu. 24. 46, 47.

Acts 2. 38.

Acts 3. 19.

Acts 8. 22.

1 Joh. 1. 9.

SECT. III.

of the same chapter. Now the reader may judge whether we, who establish our opinion by so many clear passages from Scripture, (to which we might add many more no less clear,) can be rightly charged with having collected frivolous straws of insignificant reasonings from misinterpretations of the sacred volume.

§ 13. But what does Dr. Tully bring against these clear and manifest arguments? Certainly not frivolous straws of insignificant reasonings, but one miserable little bit of sophistry, than which not even chaff itself is lighter. Thus he argues against the constant doctrine of the Prophets, of Christ and His Apostles, of Doctors, Churches, old and new, of foreign ones, in fact of all. "If true and evangelical repentance be placed before justification, then it is either before faith or after: if after faith, then also after justification; otherwise a faithful man will not be justified, and in reality will be in the same condition as an infidel, which reason (even that of our opponents) will not allow. If this repentance be placed before faith, then faith will not be the root and beginning of repentance," &c. Forsooth, the reverend gentleman presses us here with a dilemma, but a weak one indeed, and useless, inasmuch as it is clearly bad in one of its horns, as it is called; for we affirm, without fear, that true and evangelical repentance, or change of heart, ought to be placed after belief of the Gospel; since it is not possible that he can repent according to the Gospel, who has not first believed in the Gospel. And yet, says Dr. Tully, if repentance be placed after faith, therefore after justification also. We deny the consequence: how does he prove it? by an absurd argument; because otherwise it might follow that a faithful man is not yet justified, and so is in the same condition as an infidel. There is a palpable equivocation in this word 'faithful.' Faithful means two things; either a man who has faith perfected by love, or one who is endued indeed with faith, but not as yet with such a faith which penetrates powerfully into his heart and will, and so elicits true love towards God. If the word be taken in the former sense we again deny the consequence. For from rejecting this proposition, "if repentance is to be placed after faith as a single virtue, therefore after justification also," it does not

Justif. Paul. p. 162.

follow that it is possible that a faithful man, that is, one endued with perfected faith, is not yet justified; since perfected faith comprehends in its meaning true and evangelical repentance; but if the word be understood in the latter sense, namely, that he is called faithful who is endued with faith not yet perfected by love, and which has not yet produced true repentance in a man, then this proposition, "It is possible for a faithful man to be not yet justified," is so far from having any thing absurd in it, that it is a most certain truth —yea, this is the very thing we are contending for, and have just abundantly established by proofs brought from Scripture, and many other arguments. Here, then, is a plain case of begging the question, "than which," as Dr. Tully elsewhere observes, "there is hardly any other more troublesome kind of bad reasoning; for this is not to argue, but to trifle, and to waste valuable time." And thus far on the state of the question. SECT. III. Justif. Paul. p. 140.

SECTION IV.

ON CHAPTER II.—CONCERNING THE OPINION OF THE FATHERS.

Dr. Tully here for the first time attacks the author of the Harmony by name; but, alas! how unsuccessfully.

For after mentioning this author, in a few lines below, he adds, "We have him boasting that all the ships in the Piræus are his; that almost all the Fathers before St. Augustine are on his side about the righteousness of works. I cannot tell who has imposed upon him, unless it be some popish writer. Certainly it is quite plain that when he was writing these words he was but little acquainted with the writings of the Fathers." Who would not believe that I had really said all this, especially when the heading of the chapter is, "Wonderful boastings of the Author of the Harmonia Apostolica concerning the Fathers?" But alas for the credit and conscience of the man! the reader may go through the whole of my Harmony, from beginning to end, and he will find nothing of the sort. And so Dr. Tully has neither given in the text or margin either the chapter, paragraph, or page, Justif. Paul. p. 13.

SECT. IV.

where I had written this. I do not deny that I am quite persuaded that the righteousness of works, such as I defend, was upheld also not only by the majority, but by all the Fathers before St. Augustine, nay, and by St. Augustine himself, and likewise by all Catholics after him; but that I ever said this in my Harmony I entirely deny. Is this the honesty which the reverend gentleman professes, and an example of which he wished to shew his opponents?

§ 2. But how is he so certain that when I wrote the Harmony I was but little versed in the Fathers? Perhaps he learnt this from those trustworthy persons whom he mentions in his Preface. I confess most willingly that all I do is but moderate: but it is clear that the Doctor meant, that at that time I was a mere novice in the writings of antiquity. But how, I say, does he know this? In another place the reverend gentleman gives the Harmonist unasked for praise for ability and industry. Now I can confidently assert that for five years before he could be called Harmonist, or had written his Harmony, he had given almost all his ability and industry, after the study of the Holy Scriptures, to reading the works of the Fathers, and of those especially who flourished in the three first centuries. For by the advice of a very great man whose memory he cherishes with honour, he thus commenced his theological studies: and would that he were worthy enough to advise the candidates in sacred theology of our Universities (notwithstanding Dr. Tully's opposition) to do the same.

Justif. Paul. p. 139.

§ 3. But it is not hard to see with what design Dr. Tully should have charged the Harmonist with this wonderful boasting, as he calls it, about the Fathers. He wanted to fasten this reproach on his opponent's view, namely, that it was new, and repugnant to the consent of the ancient Catholic Church, and he considered it necessary for his purpose to attribute expressions to him which might give him the opportunity of discussing the opinion of the Fathers on this point. But however this may be, we are so far from avoiding this venerable tribunal of ancient doctors, that we take refuge there most willingly and joyfully, as in our own asylum. And since the reverend gentleman appeals to the Fathers, to the Fathers he shall go.

§ 4. Now we assert this of the Fathers generally; that in all those places where they teach that man is justified by faith alone, they are not speaking of faith as a single virtue, but of faith in its complex meaning, or of faith perfected, and joined with true internal contrition and love; as faith is opposed, 1st, to external works, or the actual righteousness of works; or 2ndly, to works of the natural law, done before and without the knowledge, belief, and grace of the Gospel; or 3rdly, to the works of the Mosaic law; or lastly, to meritorious works of whatever description of which man might boast before God. And to this purpose the testimonies of some ancient writers are rightly and aptly brought forward by the author of the Homily on Salvation. But with regard to the Doctor, (to give him back his own words,) "although in this controversy, when there are so many ancient champions and leaders standing against him, he does not scorn comrades, nay, he anxiously courts them, if by any means there might be an opening for enlisting them in his own service, yet unhappily for him, no one comes to his assistance, and he labours in vain to drag them on though they struggle against him." We have heard him explaining his opinion as opposed to ours in such a way as to assert that a man is justified by faith as a single virtue before all true contrition or repentance: that a wicked man is justified, that is, has his sins remitted, and he himself accounted as received into a state of salvation, while he is still wicked, &c. Now if the reverend gentleman can bring forward even one of the Fathers who has ever in his writings put forth such a pernicious opinion as this, we will yield the day to him. So far from the truth is Dr. Tully's assertion, that "the Fathers in this controversy constantly and openly profess the same opinion with himself." But now let us hear the Fathers themselves.

SECT. IV.

p. 13.

p. 15.

§ 5. Irenæus concerning Abraham, says, "For he had learned from the word of the Lord and believed on Him, wherefore it was counted to him for righteousness by the Lord: for faith which is in the Most High God, justifies a man." I hear indeed the words of the excellent Father, but we still want his meaning. Let him be his own interpreter; nor have we far to seek for the interpretation, for in the

iv. 13. [c. v. 5. p. 233.]

SECT. IV. [p. 234.] chapter immediately following of the same book he says, "For this end the Father revealed the Son, that through Him, He might be made manifest to all men, and that He might receive those who believe &c., into eternal rest. But to believe on Him, is to do His will." Who in his senses would separate justification from such a faith as this? We must also here repeat those passages from this same book of Irenæus ch. xxvii. which we have already quoted in the Examen, where these two, "to be justified by the natural works of the law," and "to be justified by faith," are put by him side by side as equivalents.

[c. xiii. p. 242.] Answer to Stricture XII. 6. *ἰσοδυναμοῦντα* [III. 9. vol. iv. p. 516.]

§ 6. Next is Origen, (the first of those Fathers whom Dr. Tully cites as witnesses to his view,) who in the third book of his commentary on the Romans, if we may trust Rufinus his translator, thus writes; "The Apostle says the justification of faith only is sufficient, so that any one if he believes is justified though he have performed no work." The answer to this is easy, for Origen is plainly speaking of faith perfected inwardly by the other virtues, as it is opposed to the performance of external works. This is clear both from the words of Adamantius, "though he have performed no work," as also from the example presently given of the thief who believed, who certainly did not obtain justification without the internal virtues of the heart. Origen however more fully explains his opinion on this point in the fourth book of the same commentaries on Rom. 4, where he has the following: "But when I return to the Scriptures, I do not find that faith is counted to all believers for righteousness; lastly, it is written of the children of Israel, 'that they believed the Lord and His servant Moses,' but it is not said as of Abraham, that it was counted to them for righteousness: 'on this account I consider that there was not in them, as we have shewn to have been in Abraham, that perfection of faith, collected from many parts and gathered into one, which is worthy to be counted for righteousness.'" Shortly afterwards he says; "His faith who believes on Him who justifies the wicked is counted for righteousness, if we remember that which we have shewn above, that not his faith who only partially believes, but who believes entirely and perfectly, can be counted for righteousness; which faith is

i.e. Origen.

[§ 1. p. 522.]

SECT. IV.

such that it justifies even him who was wicked, so that he is no longer wicked like the thief who hung upon the cross and blasphemed, but is like him who confessed and said, 'Lord Jesus remember me when Thou comest into Thy kingdom.'" What can be plainer than this? In his third Homily on Leviticus; where he is explaining allegorically the law of Moses, just at the end, he says, "Is this then the moderation of the law given, that except a man has a certain sum of money, his sin cannot be absolved? Which if taken according to the letter is plainly absurd: but in its spiritual meaning it is certain that no one can receive remission of sins, unless he bring an entire, honest and holy faith, by which he may purchase the lamb whose nature is to wash away the sins of him that believes. And this is the holy shekel, an approved (as we have said) and a sincere faith: that is, where no deceit of infidelity, no perverse craftiness of heresy is mingled, so that bringing this true faith we may be thoroughly washed in the precious blood of Christ as an immaculate victim." But if any one does not yet understand what Origen means by "the perfection of faith gathered from many parts into one," which alone is worthy to be accounted for righteousness: what is that entire, honest, holy faith, in which there is no deceit of infidelity, and without which there is no remission of sins: what, in short, is that sincere faith, which, if we offer to God, we are washed in the blood of Christ: let him go to that most explicit passage of an undoubted work of Origen's, against Celsus, where Celsus, having attributed this absurd opinion to the Christians, namely, "that as some are overcome by pity, so God through pity assists the bad, but despises on this account the good who happen to be without this affection." Origen in the name of the Christians thus answers him. "According to our view, God assists no bad man unless he be already turned to virtue, as also He never rejects the man that is already good; nor does He on account of their appealing to pity, relieve or pity any one (to use the word pity in a common meaning) but those who condemn their sins with their whole heart, and who bewail and lament over themselves as justly destroyed for their misdeeds, and who bring with them such a change as becomes penitents; these, at length, for

[vol. ii. p. 199.]

lib. iii. edit. Cant. p. 154. [§ 71. p. 494.]

SECT. IV.

the sake of their change of heart He forgives, even those reformed from the worst life. This virtue, which has taken the place of vices now driven from their heart, obtains for them that their passed sins should be forgotten." How unlike is all this to the tenets of Dr. Tully, who teaches that a man is justified, by I know not what manner of faith, before he is really contrite; that a wicked man is justified while he still remains wicked! And yet Origen in the same place plainly testifies that the view which he was explaining was the common one of all Catholics in his own age, with the exception of some senseless persons. To these might be added, if it were necessary, certain passages in which Origen plainly teaches that some good works are necessarily required for man's justification, such as a passage in Tract. 25 on St. Matthew. "In our conversations there are certain chief things necessary for the justification of our souls, such as these weighty matters of the law, judgment, mercy, and faith." But enough has been quoted from Origen.

ἀνοήτοις

[xxiii. 20. vol. iii. p. 843.]

§ 7. Let us pass from Origen to Cyprian. In the third book to Quirinus, he teaches that "faith avails for every thing," (as Pamelius reads, or "only" as the Erasmean MSS.,) "and that we are able to do in proportion as we believe." But read the chapter which immediately follows, and you will soon see Cyprian's meaning. The words are, "He can immediately obtain it" (namely, Baptism) "who truly believes. In the Acts of the Apostles; 'See, here is water: what doth hinder me to be baptized?' and Philip said, 'If thou believest with all thine heart thou mayest.'" So Cyprian is speaking of one who believes truly, and from his whole heart, and whom he affirms can obtain salvation by Baptism, before he shall have performed any actual righteousness of good works: but who ever dreamed that Cyprian meant that any one could obtain remission of sins or justification before he truly repents, surely such an one must be a mere novice in the writings of the excellent Father. For he, if any one, every where declares, in a wonderful way, and, as some have thought, immoderately, both the necessity and efficacy of repentance for obtaining remission of sins. I will quote one or two passages on this point. Thus concerning the lapsed: "I entreat you, most dear brethren, let each

in totum tantum ch. 42. [al. Testim. adv. Judæos, p. 317.]

edit. Pamel. p. 145. [p. 190-1.]

confess his sin while the sinner is yet among the living, &c. SECT. IV.
Let us turn to the Lord with the whole heart; and call down the mercy of God, by expressing repentance for our offence by genuine grief. Before Him let the soul be laid prostrate, with Him let our sadness gain peace, on Him all our hope be leant. How we ought to entreat Him Himself teaches us. 'Turn ye even to Me with all your heart and Joel 2. 12.
with fasting, and with weeping and with mourning: and rend your heart and not your garments.' To the Lord let us return with all our heart. Let us appease His wrath and displeasure with fastings, with weepings, and with mourning." So in his sixty-fifth Epistle he teaches that "crimes [p. 85.]
are done away with by proper satisfactions and lamentations, and wounds are washed away by tears." Lastly, to the heretic Novatian, towards the end; "Whilst the door of indulgence, brethren, is open, let us implore God with full satisfactions. Let us humble ourselves that we may be exalted."

§ 8. Hilary follows, who in the eighth canon on St. [p. 646.]
Matthew expressly says that 'faith alone justifies;' but let the whole passage be quoted, and it will be clear how far it is from helping the Doctor's cause. Hilary, in treating of the paralytic whom Christ had healed, and whose sins He had remitted, says; "The Scribes were indignant that a man should remit sins; for in Jesus Christ they beheld but a mere man; and that which the law had not been able to loose was remitted by Him: for faith alone justifies." Now it is quite clear that he opposes faith to the Mosaic law, which too is also clearer in the ninth canon, where we have [p. 648.]
these words: "No one is righteous by the law. He shews, then, that the boasting of righteousness was useless; for in addition to weak sacrifices, mercy is necessary to those placed under the law for salvation. For if righteousness had been by the law, pardon through grace had not been necessary."

§ 9. Let us now hear the great Basil. He thus speaks in his twenty-second Homily on Humility[i]: "For this is that perfect and entire glorying in God when a man is not puffed up on account of his own righteousness, but acknowledges that he is destitute of true righteousness, and that he is jus-

[i] Tom. i. p. 473. edit. Paris 1638. [Hom. xx. 3. vol. ii. p. 158.]

SECT. IV.

tified only by faith in Christ." But it is plain from what presently follows, that only meritorious works are excluded by Basil, from which boasting might arise, or a righteousness absolute and entirely perfect, which a man could do by his own strength, without needing pardon, or the aid of the Holy Spirit. "Here," he presently proceeds, "has all the loftiness of pride fallen: nothing is now left for boasting to thee, O man, whose glorying and hope consists in mortifying thy whole will, and in seeking for the future life in Christ, by the possession of the foretaste of which we are already in those things wholly living in the grace and gift of God. And it is God who worketh in us both to will and to do according to His good pleasure," &c. Read what follows. From others of his writings too it is quite certain that it never entered Basil's mind that man was justified by faith as a single virtue alone, that is, had remission of sins given him, and accounted as accepted for salvation before true repentance. For he expressly asserts that faith is not sufficient without true repentance. Moral. Sent. Reg. 1. Elsewhere he no less plainly teaches that faith is not perfected except by Baptism, by which our covenant is sealed with the Lord. So also in his work on the Holy Spirit, chap. 12, near the end, he says, "Faith and Baptism are the two modes of salvation cognate with, and inseparable from each other; for faith is perfected by Baptism, and Baptism is founded upon faith." And presently, in the end of the chapter; "A profession indeed precedes, leading the way to salvation; but Baptism follows, sealing our assent." And surely the necessity of Baptism and of those things which dispose a man for Baptism, for obtaining remission of sins, which is repeated again and again in the Holy Scriptures, and which almost takes up every page in the writings of the ancients, affords sufficient argument thoroughly to overturn this Solifidianism which many have endeavoured to support as well from proofs from Scripture as from the writings of the Fathers, as our most learned and pious Thorndike, now with God, has excellently shewn throughout his writings. For it appears from this that faith is not sufficient by itself for obtaining justification, but that outward Baptism, where it can be had, is also required: but above all, that promise

tom. ii. p. 410. [vol. ii. p. 234.]

tom. ii. p. 316. [vol. iii. p. 23.]

ὁ μακαρίτης

of a new life is necessary, which is wont to be made in Baptism. This St. Peter plainly teaches us: "Baptism doth also now save us, (not the putting away of the filth of the flesh, but the answer of a good conscience towards God,) by the resurrection of Jesus Christ," where "the answer of a good conscience" is well turned by learned interpreters, as the promise or stipulation of a good conscience, and signifies the same as "our consent," in the passage above quoted from Basil. For in Baptism, the Bishop used to ask, "Dost thou renounce Satan?" the person to be baptized answered, "I do renounce:" when asked, "Dost thou take thy part in Christ?" he answered, "I do take my part." Tertullian on Baptism calls this "the promise of salvation:" the same author says in his treatise on the Resurrection of the Flesh, "The soul is sanctified not by the washing, but by the answer." Cyprian calls it the "interrogation of Baptism." Now to this "stipulation of a good conscience," the salvation which is conferred by Baptism is clearly attributed by St. Peter, namely, remission of sins, and a right to eternal life, not to the outward washing in itself. For without this stipulation (which is nothing else than an undertaking of the whole of Christianity or evangelical law, even where it commands the taking up of the cross) no one, though endued with ever so much faith, can obtain remission of sins and a right to eternal life; but these effects of Baptism are by no means absolutely dependant on the external ceremony of the Sacrament, that being a thing from which any one may be debarred by peculiar circumstances, who may yet have embraced Christianity sincerely in his heart. But let us pass from Basil to the other Fathers.

SECT. IV.

1 Epist. iii. 21.

συγκατάθεσις

[c. vi. p. 226.]

[ch. xlviii. p. 355.]

Ep. 70 and 76. [p. 125 and 154.]

§ 10. Ambrose may come next, or the author of the Commentaries attributed to Ambrose. He makes this remark on Rom. 3. 24. "They are justified gratuitously, because having done nothing nor making any return, they are justified by faith alone, the gift of God." But it is clear that here faith is not opposed to any works proceeding from faith, neither to the internal virtues of hope, contrition, &c., but to the works of the Mosaic law, or even to the works of nature performed before and without the faith and grace of the Gospel. He speaks very plainly of works of the former kind

[vol. ii. p. 46.]

SECT. IV. [p. 47.] in his comments on verses 27, 28, 29. "Having given the reason, he says he is speaking to those under the law, because they were boasting without a cause, flattering themselves about the law, and because they were of the race of Abraham, not perceiving that man is not justified in God's sight, except by faith, 'We conclude then, that a man is justified by faith without the works of the law.' He speaks of a Gentile as certainly justified by believing without doing any works of the law, that is, without circumcision, or new moons, or observance of the sabbath," &c. Presently he speaks of both kinds of works, of the Mosaic and of the natural law together. "Since they who keep either the Mosaic or natural law, are justified for the present, so that they are not guilty in the present judgment: wherefore he says, 'For if Abraham were justified by works, he hath whereof to glory, but not before God,' for, he says, 'Whosoever doeth the law, shall live in it:' that is, he shall not die guilty, and yet shall he not have merit for this before God, but by faith." Hence the same author elsewhere plainly teaches that "Faith without love has no deserts," that is, cannot obtain justification and salvation, the reason being added, "because love is the head of religion, and he who has not the head has not life:" and presently, "nothing profits without love, because love is the foundation of religion."

cap. iv. 2. [p. 47,48.]

In 1 Cor. 13. 2, 3.

§ 11. Let Chrysostom now be heard. He thus speaks in his Sermon of Faith and the Law: "I can shew a man that by faith without works was gifted with life and the kingdom. Not one hath ever lived without faith: but the thief by believing only was justified. And say not, he had not the time for living well: for I am not disputing about that, but this I have made clear, that faith alone, even by itself, saves. For certainly, if he had survived his believing and had neglected to do good works, he would have fallen from salvation."

But it is quite clear that Chrysostom is speaking here of true faith, and perfected by internal love, opposed to external works, or pious deeds, which a believer prevented by time or opportunity could not perform: this I say is clear both from the words themselves, and I have already proved it by several arguments in the Harmony, where, not to go over old ground, I refer my reader.

II. Diss. xviii. 9. p. 213.

§ 12. Let Augustine close the band, whose single opinion (though he be a great teacher) Dr. Tully with extraordinary rashness prefers to the judgment of all antiquity wherever that may differ from him. He, indeed, in his eighty-third question thus writes: "If a man, as soon as he believed, should straightway depart from this life, the justification of faith remains with him, without good works preceding, because he did not attain unto it by merit but by grace: or subsequent, because none were allowed to be done in this life." But it is plain that by those good works preceding, which Augustine here excludes, we must understand those which come before the knowledge, belief, and grace of the Gospel, which indeed are none: and that by subsequent good works, Augustine meant external works, or, as they say, actual righteousness, or a holy conversation, which it is possible one who believes and loves God may not perform, being prevented by death. For Augustine is expressly treating about works without which a man can be saved: and he has taught over and over again, that no one can obtain salvation and eternal life without the internal virtues of hope, love, contrition, &c.; and this is confessed by all men in their senses. Therefore Augustine is plainly talking of faith formed by love. And in good truth Dr. Tully has managed very badly for his own cause, by appealing especially to the judgment of Augustine, than whom no one has more frequently or more openly condemned his opinion. I have already observed in the Examen that the holy Father distinguished between these three, "believing God," "believing a God," and "believing on God," and to this last faith alone is remission of sins and a right to salvation attributed. (I forbear using the word justification, because it is well known that that word is generally used by Augustine in a different sense to what we use it in.) Faith *on* God he thus explains: "What then is to believe on God? To love Him by believing, to choose Him by believing, to go to Him by believing, and to be incorporated among His members." And every one who knows any thing of his writings, must be aware that this was his constant teaching. For that excellent Father has written an entire work on Faith and Works, in which he purposely refutes their error who teach that faith is by

SECT. IV.

Just. Paul. p. 13, 14. 83 quæst. q. 76. [vol. vi. p. 67.]

Answer to Strict. XIII. 15. p. 120. Tract. 29. in Joan.

SECT. IV.

itself sufficient for obtaining the saving effects of Baptism, that is, remission of sins and a right to eternal life. But it is worth while to hear both how Augustine has explained the design of this work itself, and what he has expressly taught in it concerning this subject. He thus writes concerning the design of the work; "In the mean time some writings have been sent to me by certain brethren, laymen indeed, but persons studious in Divine things, which make such a distinction between good works and Christian faith, that one might be persuaded that one could not attain eternal life without the latter, but that one might without the former. In answer to which I have written a book entitled 'On Faith and Works,' in which I have shewn not only how those regenerated by the grace of Christ ought to live, but what kind of persons they ought to be who are admitted to the laver of regeneration." In the book itself he crushes these Solifidians with many arguments, shewing at some length that no one can possibly obtain remission of sins and salvation in Baptism by faith alone, without true repentance for his sins: and you have the summing up of the whole work in chapter 20, where Augustine thus beautifully describes the whole method of obtaining remission and salvation as laid down in the Gospel: "This is the order of the cure, that the persons to be baptized believe in God the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit, in that order in which the Creed is given: and that they repent of their dead works, and doubt not but that they will receive in Baptism entire remission of their passed sins: not that permission is given them to sin, but that it hurts not to have sinned; that there is remission of what has been done, not permission to do. Then this can be truly said even spiritually: 'See, thou art made whole, sin no more.'" I conclude this section with Dr. Tully's own words: "Our opponents, I suppose, have had enough of the Fathers, and if necessary they might have had more. Let us now proceed to the reformed Churches."

Retract. lib. ii. cap. 38. [vol. i. p. 55.]

tom. iv. p. 33. [vol. vi. p. 185-6.]

curatio

SECTION V.

ON CHAPTER III.—THE JUDGMENT OF THE ENGLISH CHURCH.

SECT. V.

§ 1. In this chapter Dr. Tully works himself into an extraordinary state of agitation: he exclaims, vociferates, thunders forth, and presently triumphs; he tramples on the conquered Harmonist, displays his trophies, and sings his hymn of victory, though as yet he has never approached our ranks. But I beg the reader to read over again attentively the full explanation of the Judgment of the Church of England on this point which I have given in the second Dissertation of the Harmony, and in the Examen, in the answer to the twenty-third Stricture, and he will easily perceive from thence how uselessly he has wasted these many words. It is not necessary to go over the whole case again, to persons more acquainted with it: but since the reverend gentleman seems to have placed the chief support of his cause in the argument of this chapter, and it would be very easy for an incautious or inattentive reader to be taken in and deceived by these specious words, he will not object perhaps in this place also to follow the Doctor step by step.

xviii. 6. et seqq.

§ 2. After a little skirmishing in the beginning of the chapter, he thus engages in the contest: "Let the Church of England be heard concerning this controversy about justification which has lately begun to make a noise; let us listen to her decree in the eleventh article. 'We are accounted righteous before God only for the merit of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ by faith, and not for our own works or deservings: wherefore that we are justified by faith only is a most wholesome doctrine &c.' What can be clearer, not even the sun at noon-day?" But why does the reverend gentleman stop near the end of the article, half down the hill, as the saying is? why not quote the whole of it as it stands? why does he obtrude upon us his *et cæteras?* Certainly it would not have taken much time or breath to quote the very few words which close the article, viz. "as more largely is expressed in the Homily of Justification." But Dr. Tully saw that these last words threatened ruin to his cause, and there-

ut in dicto verbio est

SECT. V. fore took care to suppress them. Indeed our Church thus expressly refers us to the Homily of the Justification of Man, that we may get from thence the true and genuine sense and explanation of the article itself; nor does she explain this doctrine "that we are justified by faith only," and which she recommends to her sons as most wholesome, otherwise than "is explained more largely in the Homily of Justification." I have consulted the Homily: I have quoted that more full explanation, in the very words of the Homily: and lastly, I have testified to all how heartily I subscribe to that explanation. Why is the reverend gentleman silent at all this? why does he not answer even a word? Do these artifices become an upright man and a lover of truth?

§ 3. But presently, that he may not seem to have treated us altogether unfairly, Dr. Tully permits us to go to the Homilies, but not to that more fully expressed explanation which is purposely given by the author of the Homily as the genuine, full, and perfect meaning of the article, and the whole of which I myself transcribed in the Harmony word for word, but to certain scraps of the Homily, and these by no means faithfully translated by him, and, further, wretchedly distorted by his interpretations. For thus he begins his attack on the author of the Harmony, out of the Homily: "Let us consult then the first Homily, on the Salvation of Mankind, near the end, (on which I know not why he is wholly silent.) 'Faith (says the Church) doth not shut out repentance, hope, &c., joined with faith in every man that is justified: but it shutteth them out from the office of justifying.' Nothing can be plainer; here then is a deep silence on the part of the Harmonist, who if he adverts to the passage, by no means should have drowned it in silence." To this I answer; If the reverend gentleman was before ignorant why the Harmonist was wholly silent on the first part of the Homily, let him now know that the reason was because in this part the exclusive particle "only," and the meaning of the phrase "we are justified by faith only," are not so fully and expressly treated of, and that was the only point on which any question was raised in that chapter of the Harmony where the Harmonist quoted the Homily. For the writer shews in the first part of the Homily, that three things in all,

necessarily concur for the justification of man; namely, on God's part, His mere and wonderful grace and mercy; on Christ's, His death and meritorious sacrifice: and lastly, on man's part, true and lively faith. Which last point the author in the first part had only lightly touched upon towards the end, but in the two following parts, and especially the second, he explains elaborately and at length; and in so accurate and careful a manner, that there is no room for doubting concerning the genuine meaning of this proposition, "we are justified by faith only," unless it be to sophists, and those who delight in mere splitting of straws. So that if Dr. Tully had been anxious, as he professes to be, about being candid, surely he should have rather praised than called into suspicion my integrity and simplicity, who did not seek for nooks in which to rest my arguments, nor quote capriciously the words of the Homily, but appealed to those passages where the author of the Homily plainly professes to have given his mind and opinion on the subject, clearly, fully, and perfectly. Would that the reverend gentleman had been equally candid! and indeed, I truly am ignorant how he can have been so entirely silent on that so lengthened and clearly worded explanation of the article, "we are justified by faith only," which I gave from the second part of the Homily, unless he thought it better to fly from the open light, which he was unable to bear. SECT. V.

§ 4. However this may be, there is certainly nothing in this first part of the Homily which I fear as dangerous to my cause; nor am I conscious of having any where written any thing differing a hair's breadth from the opinion of the author, as there given us. But with regard to the passage brought forward from it by the Doctor, I cannot sufficiently express my surprise that it should have been so paraded by him, whereas if brought forward as it stands, and faithfully translated, it is clearly against him. The passage, word for word, runs thus: "That faith" (namely, a true and lively one, of which he had been speaking in the words immediately preceding) "doth not shut out repentance, hope, love, dread, and the fear of God, to be joined with faith in every man that is justified: but it shutteth them out from the office of justifying. So that although they be all present Hom. B. I. [p. 19. ed. 1840.]

SECT. V. together in him that is justified, yet they justify not altogether. Nor the faith also doth not shut out the justice of our good works necessarily to be done afterwards of duty towards God: (for we are most bounden to serve God, in doing good deeds, commanded by Him in His Holy Scripture, all the days of our life:) but it excludeth them, so that we may not do them to this intent, to be made good by doing of them. For all the good works that we can do be unperfect, and therefore not able to deserve our justification." In which passage two things require especial notice. 1. That the author of the Homily openly recognises the necessity of other virtues besides faith, namely, repentance, hope, love, fear of God, by which a man is disposed to receive the grace of justification. For he does not only say that those virtues are 'joined with faith,' but 'are *to be* joined,' in every justified man, (which Dr. Tully wretchedly turns "quin in omni homine justificato cum ea consocientur,") which way of speaking evidently shews this necessity. Which is hence still more evident, for the author distinguishing between that habitual righteousness (as it is called) consisting of the internal virtues of faith, hope, repentance, love, &c., and the actual righteousness of good works, or conspicuous deeds—teaches, concerning the former, that it is of necessity required in every man who is to be justified: concerning the latter, that it must necessarily be performed afterwards, that is, after justification. Or the former righteousness is requisite, as we have said, for receiving the grace of justification, the latter to preserve the same grace. Whence (to note this by the way) it is most clear that I have followed the opinion of the Church of England in her twelfth article, where she teaches that good works follow justification, when I interpreted the article only of the actual righteousness of works. For in this passage of the Homily the Church clearly distinguishes between that righteousness of works which must necessarily be done after justification, from the internal virtues of faith, repentance, hope, &c. which are conjointly required in the man who is to be justified. But how can this distinction exist if all our righteousness, as well habitual as actual, be posterior to justification?

Harm. II. Diss. xviii. 8. p. 209.

§ 5. A remarkable passage from our great divine Richard

SECT. V.

Hooker, in his Sermon on Justification, whom Dr. Tully some where in vain appeals to, will serve as a commentary upon these words: when having laid down the twofold righteousness of Christians, he says, "The one without us, which we have by imputation: the other in us, which consisteth of faith, hope, charity, and other Christian virtues:" and then he divides the 'righteousness,' which he calls 'sanctifying' "into habitual, or that holiness wherewith our souls are imbued the same instant when first we begin to be temples of the Holy Ghost; and into actual, or that holiness which afterward beautifieth all the parts and actions of our life:" and then he thus proceeds to explain the order in which this threefold righteousness, imputed, habitual, and actual, is given us: "If it be here demanded which of these we do first receive, I answer, that the Spirit, the virtues of the Spirit, the habitual justice which is engrafted, and the external justice of Jesus Christ which is imputed, these we receive all at one and the same time: whensoever we have any of these, we have all: they go together. Yet sith no man is justified except he believe, and no man believeth except he have faith, and no man hath faith unless he have received the Spirit of adoption, forasmuch as these do necessarily infer justification, but justification doth of necessity presuppose them, we must needs hold that imputed righteousness, in dignity being chiefest, is notwithstanding, in order, last of all these: but actual righteousness, which is the righteousness of good works, succeedeth all, followeth after all, both in order and in time. Which thing being attentively marked, sheweth plainly how the faith of true believers cannot be divorced from hope and love: how faith is a part of sanctification, and yet unto justification necessary; how faith is perfected by good works and yet no work of ours good without faith: finally, how our Fathers might hold we are justified by faith alone, and yet hold truly that without good works we are not justified." Although I do not entirely approve of the whole of this explanation, (and be it said with all reverence for such a man,) especially where he makes the Spirit of adoption, and indwelling of the same Spirit, prior, at least in the order of nature, to our justification, (on which point look back to Section III. 4,) yet I thought it was to be brought

[vol. iii. pt. 2. p. 631. Oxf. ed. 1836.]

SECT. V. forward because, on the whole, it extraordinarily illustrates the words quoted from the Homily, and is most directly opposed to the opinion of our Doctor: For, 1st. Hooker here distinctly shews that although the actual righteousness of works is altogether posterior to justification, yet that righteousness consisting of the internal virtues of faith, hope, and love, and which he calls implanted, habitual, and sanctifying rightcousness, precedes in the order of nature the imputation of righteousness, or our justification: as it is clearly stated in the words of the Homily, that the righteousness of good works or deeds must necessarily be performed after justification, but that repentance, hope, love, must be joined with faith in every man who is to be justified. I shall think Dr. Tully a really great man if he can reconcile his doctrine with this, in which he shews that a man is justified before true and saving contrition, that a wicked man is justified while he is still wicked, and lastly, (what he gives in his Catechism to youth as a principle of theology,) that all our sanctification is, in the order of nature, posterior to justification. 2nd. Our great divine expressly takes notice of these two points, that man is justified by faith only, without works, and that man cannot be justified without works, as by no means contradictory propositions, if that distinction between habitual and actual righteousness of works be attended to. It is indeed rightly stated, that man is justified by faith only, (namely, faith 'informed' or perfected by love,) without works, that is, without the actual righteousness of works, inasmuch as that follows our first justification. On the other hand, it is rightly said that man is not justified by faith only without works, namely, those internal ones of hope, love, &c., inasmuch as they precede a man's justification, at least in the order of nature, and are entirely requisite for it. I appeal to the Doctor's conscience whether I have not frequently given, in explicit terms, this very explanation of the article in the Harmony? But let us return to the Homily.

ch. 10.

§ 6. 2ndly. The other point to which I would especially call the reader's attention, in the above-quoted words of the Homily, is this, that the author, by the expression "office of justifying," which he separates from works, does not in any sense mean that instrumentality in the work of justification

SECT. V.

which is so much talked of by some, or any thing else which can be attributed strictly to faith, (as Dr. Tully seems to have thought,) but the efficient cause, whether principal or meritorious, of our justification, which is to be separated as well from faith itself as from the rest of our virtues. Indeed I know not with what eyes the reverend gentleman could have read the Homily, and altogether have passed over this which is so obvious, and which forces itself upon the reader in every word. For from the words preceding the passage quoted, at the distance of only three lines, it is quite evident what is meant by "works being excluded from the work of justifying." They are, "The grace of God doth not shut out the justice of God in our justification, but only shutteth out the justice of man, that is to say, the justice of our works, as to be merits of our justification." In the passage already quoted, the words are plain; "Faith excludeth them so that we may not do them to this intent, to be made just by the doing of them. For all the good works which we can do, be imperfect, and therefore are not able to deserve our justification." What will he make of the author's expressly separating (in the second part of the Homily) the work of justifying from every virtue or work of ours, attributing it to God alone through Christ? Let us hear his own words: "Justification," says he, "is not the office of man, but of God: for man cannot make himself righteous by his own works, neither in part, nor in the whole: for that were the greatest arrogancy and presumption of man that Antichrist could set up against God, to affirm that a man might by his own works take away and purge his own sins, and so justify himself: but justification is the office of God only," &c. Read also the remainder of this passage. But how, you will say, does faith exclude both itself and the rest of our virtues from the work of justifying, that is, from the meritorious efficient cause of our justification? I answer, Because faith implies a respect unto the gratuitous promise of God, which has been obtained and confirmed by the Blood and propitiatory Sacrifice of Jesus Christ our Lord, by which, remission of sins and eternal salvation is gratuitously given to the greatest sinners, but who are truly penitent for their sins, for the sake of Christ alone. But of this more shall be said presently.

Hom. B. 1. p. 17. [p. 23.]

SECT. V.

§ 7. Dr. Tully proceeds to another passage of the Homily, which I also had quoted in the Harmony. Here again the reverend gentleman abounds in extraordinary and vehement rhetoricisms: he inveighs with great pomp against the recklessness of the young Harmonist, and further charges him with having gainsaid directly the Church of England: he professes to be thoroughly astounded, he complains of a profession being attached to the Church, which can no where be found unless perhaps in some Utopian archives: lastly, he says that that must now be said by the Church and her true children, which Cæsar, about to be slain, once said in the senate, "Surely this is violence." But I again beg the reader not to be terrified with these hobgoblin expressions, but to attend and keep his mind to the subject itself, and he will then see how here, as on other occasions, a great noise is made about nothing at all. But that the whole matter may be brought to light, some repetitions must be here made from the Harmony. I there brought forward a passage from the third part of the Homily of Salvation, which runs word for word as follows: "Truth it is, that our own works do not justify us, to speak properly of our justification: that is to say, our works do not merit or deserve remission of our sins, and make us of unjust just before God: but God of His mere own mercy through the only merits and deservings of His Son Jesus Christ doth justify us. Nevertheless, because faith doth directly send us to Christ, for remission of our sins, and that, by faith given us of God, we embrace the promise of God's mercy, and of the remission of our sins, (which thing none other of our virtues or works properly doth,) therefore Scripture useth to say that faith without works doth justify." To which passage of the Homily I subjoin my own words: "From which appears the whole of what must be separately attributed to faith in the matter of justification, in the opinion of our Church, which is, that although other virtues are no less necessary to justification than faith itself, and faith in reality has no more effect in it than any other virtue, but yet of all the virtues faith is that one by which we embrace the Gospel promise, by which promise we are justified, therefore by a convenient phrase, our justification may be and is usually attributed to faith only, and this by a

Justif. Paul. p. 22, 23.

μορμολυκείοις

II. Diss. xviii. 6. p. 200.

[Hom. i. p. 25.]

metonymy in which the act is put for the object, with which it has to do." Hear now what Dr. Tully says to this: "Who is not perfectly amazed at this, when he hears the Church giving a contrary definition, in the precisest terms, again and again? Our Church lays down, in words which cannot be clearer, 'that faith is said to justify, because it contributes that towards justification which no other virtue, no other human work can do.'" But who does not here find a want of good faith and straightforwardness in the Doctor? For where has the author of the Homily these words, which Dr. Tully has taken care to have printed in italics, as if really the author's own: "Since it (faith) contributes that to justification which no other virtue, no other human work can do?" So far from its being true that he says this over and over again in the precisest terms, he does not even once say any thing from which such a conclusion as this can be fairly drawn. He constantly teaches that neither faith, nor any other virtue of ours, contributes any thing towards our justification, otherwise than as the disposition or condition requisite on our parts, in which way he equally acknowledges that not only faith, but also repentance conduces towards our justification. In the passage which we have now before us, the author of the Homily teaches us three things: 1st. That no work or virtue of ours justifies us if we speak strictly of justification, that is, they do not merit remission of our sins, and make us just of unjust in the sight of God. 2ndly. That faith alone, of all the other virtues, leads us directly to Christ, and embraces the gratuitous promise of Divine mercy. 3rdly. Therefore it is said in Scripture, that faith without works justifies, in order that all merit of ours may be excluded from the matter of justification, as the author of the Homily frequently explains it. Now, had the author of the Harmony ever denied any one of these three points? on the contrary, he most explicitly recognises them all in his Harmony. "The word 'faith' excludes merit in this sense also, because so far as it refers to a free promise, it expects its reward only from the free gift of God, Who promises. And this, if I mistake not, is the chief reason why the Holy Spirit is wont to express all the obedience taught in the Gospel by the word 'faith,' because by this word is shewn that the obedience we pay to God does

SECT. V.

II. Diss. v. 5. p. 70.

SECT. V.

not obtain righteousness or salvation by its own force or merit, but by force of the covenant or free promise which is received by faith." But in what manner faith leads us directly to Christ, I have thus shewn. "But because the promise of eternal life, given in the Gospel, is founded in the meritorious satisfaction of Jesus Christ, and confirmed by His most precious blood, therefore the obedience of faith continually refers to Christ as the only Propitiator: and His most perfect obedience in life and death is the only circumstance which makes our imperfect and spiritless obedience acceptable to God unto salvation, and to carry off the reward of eternal life." The reader would do well, if he has leisure, to read the whole of this paragraph. But that neither here nor elsewhere the author of the Homily ever thought of that instrumentality, strictly so called, of faith in the matter of justification for which many so sharply contend, I have sufficiently proved in the Harmony: wherefore, all these things being weighed, I shall leave it to the judgment of the conscientious reader whether recklessness is to be here ascribed to the young or to the old writer.

II. Diss. v. 5. p. 71.

II. Diss. xviii.

ἀβλεψία

§ 8. There yet remains the third and last passage from the Homily which Dr. Tully has brought against our opinion, and from which he holds thunders and lightnings over our heads. "Against the followers of works, our mildest of mothers, kindled with zeal towards God, thus, contrary to her custom, fulminates in the Homily of Salvation; 'This doctrine,' (i. e. of justification by faith alone without works,) 'all old and ancient writers of Christ's Church do approve: this doctrine advanceth and setteth forward the true glory of Christ, and beateth down the vain glory of man: this, whosoever denieth,' (attend, O reader,) 'is not to be accounted for a Christian, but for an adversary to Christ and His Gospel, and for a setter forth of men's vain glory.' What stupendous words are these, of what an awful sound!" I answer: What Dr. Tully means here by ἐργοδιώκτας, I do not know, as neither do I understand some other of his elegant expressions. But whatever it is, these thunderbolts do not strike us, inasmuch as they are aimed by our mildest of mothers, roused by just fervour and zeal towards God, only at the supporters of human merits. Let us quote

ἐργοδιώκτας

pt. ii. [p. 22.]

the whole passage as it stands, which Dr. Tully, that it might serve his own cause, has given us cut up and broken. SECT. V.

"This saying, that we be justified by faith only, freely, and without works, is spoken for to take away clearly all merit of our works, as being unable to deserve our justification at God's hands, and thereby most plainly to express the weakness of man and the goodness of God; the great infirmity of ourselves and the might and power of God; the imperfectness of our own works, and the most abundant grace of our Saviour Christ; and therefore wholly to ascribe the merit and deserving of our justification unto Christ only, and His most precious blood-shedding. This faith the Holy Scripture teacheth: this is the strong rock and foundation of Christian religion; this doctrine all old and ancient authors of Christ's Church do approve:" and so it goes on, as quoted by the Doctor. Surely, nothing is more evident from these words than that those alone are affected by this anathema, and are rejected from the society of Christians, who defend the meritoriousness of good works. But what is this to the author of the Harmony? So far is he from defending the merit of good works, that he is clearly of the same opinion against them as the author of the Homily. Hear his own words from the Harmony: "Surely those do not deserve the name of Christians who teach such a kind of merit. And I will confidently pronounce that those who have thoroughly imbibed such a shocking principle, have scarcely, ay never, known or felt the grace of Christ. Modesty of mind is the very soul of Christianity, and he that is without it, is as the dead body of a Christian, not a true and living Christian: but to such modesty, what can be more opposite than the above proud presumption of merit?" From this the reader will see with what fairness Dr. Tully has abused the words of the Homily, that he might crush his opponent with the anathema of the English Church.

[Hom. i. p. 22.]

II. Diss. xviii. 4. p. 195.

§ 9. I have at length gone through all those passages which Dr. Tully, after having carefully searched every nook and corner, as it appears, could bring forward from the Homily of the Salvation of Man, in support of his own against our explanation of the article. Now let passage be compared with passage, namely, the many clear and distinct

SECT. V.

passages from the Homily which I have fully and fairly quoted in the Harmony and Examen, with those few which Dr. Tully has given, broken, cut up, and evidently distorted by his own interpretations, and then I will willingly leave it to the decision of any fair-minded person to say to which interpretation of the article, mine or his, the author of the Homily would give his assent, to whom the article itself expressly refers us as its legitimate interpreter. Indeed I cannot but be surprised at the consummate confidence of the Doctor, who after so light a contest, or rather a skirmish, so unsuccessfully brought to a close, thus votes himself a triumph. "It is more than sufficiently evident, as I think, on the part of the Church of England, that she not only does not support with her assent, but utterly abominates all kind of righteousness of works:" i. e. even that which we defend.

ἐργοδικαίωσις

§ 10. Before, however, we proceed to the rest of this chapter, it may be as well to strengthen our explanation of the article, which to the fair-minded reader we must have already sufficiently proved by the passages cited from the Homily, with the authority and support of one of our most learned and most approved theologians, who was famous for his writings long before those twenty years which Dr. Tully has determined as the æra of the new ecclesiastical doctrine introduced amongst us: and this too, lest any one, finding that he is unable to refute it by other means, should brand it with the invidious name of novelty. This is the late most worthy Dean of Gloucester, Richard Field, a divine of keen judgment and great reading, who in the Appendix to the second chapter of his third book on the Church, after he had answered the Papists who objected against our doctrine that "man is justified by faith only without works," by saying that the same doctrine had been handed down by the ancients in the very same formula of words, goes on to enquire in what sense both ancient and modern divines have understood these words. "By these phrases of speech," he says, "they sometimes exclude (1.) all that may be without supernatural knowledge, all that may be without a true profession: (2.) sometimes the necessity of good works in act, or external good works: (3.) The power of nature without

Just. Paul. p. 26.

p. 323, 324 [ed. Oxon. 1628.]

illumination and grace. (4.) The power of the law. (5.) The sufficiency of any thing found in us to make us stand in judgment, to abide the trial, and not to fear condemnation. And in this sense faith only is said to justify, that is, the only mercy of God, and merit of Christ apprehended by faith: and then the meaning of their speech is, that only the persuasion and assured trust that they have, to be accepted of God, for Christ's sake, is that that maketh them stand in judgment without fear of condemnation. And in this sense all the divines formerly alleged, for proof of the insufficiency of all our inherent righteousness and the trust which we should have in the only mercy of God, and merit of Christ, do teach as we do, that faith only justifieth. For neither they nor we exclude from the work of justification, the action of God as the supreme and highest cause of our justification: for it is He that remitteth, and receiveth us to grace: nor the merit of Christ, as that for which God inclineth to shew mercy to us, and to respect us: nor the remission of sins, gracious acceptation and grant of the gift of righteousness, as that by which we are formally justified: nor those works of preventing grace, whereby out of the general apprehension of faith, God worketh in us dislike of our former condition, desire to be reconciled to God, to have remission of that which is past, and grace hereafter to decline the like evils, and to do the contrary good things. For by these we are prepared, disposed, and fitted for justification, without these none are justified. And in this sense, and to imply the necessity of these to be found in us, sometimes the Fathers and others say we are not justified by faith only. And we all agree that it is not our conversion to God, nor the change we find in ourselves, that can any way make us stand in judgment without fear, and look for any good from God otherwise than in that we find ourselves so disposed and fitted as is necessary for justification, whence we assure ourselves God will in mercy accept us for Christ's sake."

SECT. V.

§ 11. This explanation of the article certainly coincides in all its parts with our interpretation of it, as given in the Harmony: but it does not in any way square with that of the Doctor. For 1st. Good works, which the most learned gentleman wished to have excluded from the proposition, 'we

SECT. V.

are justified by faith only without works,' are by himself reduced in all to five heads. 1. Works done without an external revelation of the Gospel. 2. External works, or the actual righteousness of works. 3. Works of nature, done without the internal grace of the Gospel. 4. Works of the law, i. e. the Mosaic. 5. And lastly, meritorious works, which are done with the opinion and in the confidence of their being meritorious. Now I ask the Doctor to bring forward a passage where the author of the Harmony attributes the first justification to any of these works: on the contrary, he expressly and very frequently excludes all these works from that first justification. 2ndly. He expressly shews that the meaning and view of all our divines who have used this mode of speaking, was on the whole this: that there is no virtue or good work of ours on which we can rely and stand fearless at the judgment of God, without the mercy of God and the merits of Christ our Saviour: and that next, all those divines who acknowledge that all our inherent righteousness is insufficient, and that we ought to place our trust only in the mercy of God and merits of our Saviour, teach the same thing, namely, that faith only justifies. And this is the very explanation of the article for which we are contending, but which Dr. Tully rejects as not being full or sufficient. 3rdly. He makes the formal cause of our justification to consist in the admission of our sins, and our acceptance to salvation, and not (as does Dr. Tully) in the imputation of Christ's righteousness. Forsooth, that clear-sighted divine perceived that the righteousness of Christ, which, in agreement with all Catholics, he had laid down as the primary meritorious cause of our justification, could not be made at the same time its formal cause, without a gross absurdity, and even a manifest contradiction. For the meritorious cause is of the nature of an efficient, which is only an external cause: but the formal cause is internal, and constitutes the essence of the thing effected: so for the same thing to be at once the meritorious and formal cause of the same thing that is effected implies a contradiction: for thus it would be and not be of the essence of the thing at the same time. Hence it is that the learned man in the same chapter clearly teaches from Durandus that the righteousness of Christ does

SECT. V.

Justif. Paul. p. 91.

not become ours formally, (which formal imputation Dr. Tully defends against Bellarmine, not without great injury to the reformed cause,) but only effectively, that is, as far as regards its saving fruits and effects. His words are: "For, as Durandus correctly observes, although the merits and good works of one man cannot be so imputed to another as to be accounted for his merits, and as that he should be supposed to have merited and to have performed those good works, yet they can be so communicated that their fruits and advantage may redound to him, and he for another's sake be accounted as if he had himself performed them." 4thly. The learned divine clearly teaches that in this proposition, we are justified by faith alone without works, the works of preventing grace are by no means excluded from the first justification, namely, true contrition for sin, ardent desire for the Divine favour, and for the grace of the Holy Spirit, whereby, for the future, we may be able to abstain from sin and do good works: which desire necessarily presupposes the purpose of a new life; which works occur in Scripture under the name of conversion or renewing; but that all these are of necessity required first in a man, in order that he may be disposed, prepared, and made fit by them to receive the grace of justification. Now let Dr. Tully's divinity be compared with this; who lays down that true contrition is not necessary for justification, that a wicked man is justified in the concurrent sense, i. e. while he is still wicked, that no virtue or human work is requisite for justification, more than for a man already *born* to be born; let this comparison, I say, be made, and it will soon be seen how different are their lines of demarcation. 5thly. Lastly, that great divine declares that in this sense it was sometimes rightly said by the Fathers and others, that man is not justified by faith only, because those works of preventing grace are of necessity required with faith which are comprehended under the name of conversion, even for obtaining the final justification. I now appeal to the Doctor's conscience, whether I ever denied, in any other sense than this, that man was justified by faith only.

§ 12. What follows after this in the chapter, is written by Dr. Tully in a declamatory style about the royal declaration

SECT. V.

prefixed to our Articles, about the canon of the Church, the subscriptions and oaths so often repeated by us. As soon, however, as Dr. Tully shall have proved that we have ever taught any thing contrary to the clear definitions of our Church, then, and not till then, will we confess that these charges have any thing to do with us. But since he has not yet proved this, and I know well enough is not likely ever to do so, there is no reason that we should be in the least annoyed by all this, although it be most tragically stated on his part. But I heartily wish that the reverend gentleman when he comes to be tried concerning his dogmas, may as easily acquit himself. I do not, however, think that this should be passed over, which Dr. Tully brings against some of his innovators, namely, that they teach, in opposition to the eighteenth article of our Church, that the way to heaven is open even to the heathens, who have no faith in Christ, and who have not renounced their idols; and he adds, that he is speaking of what is very well known. Now certainly, though he does say it is so known to the very lowest, I have never before heard of it. Neither, I take leave to say, is the Doctor's authority of such weight with me, nor ought it to be, that I should easily believe his bare asseveration that any one of those who wish to be considered most submissive sons of the Church of England (and of these he is expressly speaking) ever sent forth so barefaced an assertion either in his sermons or writings. If any one, however, has been so insane, let him answer for himself: I do not wish to be his supporter. With regard to myself, it may be seen in the Appendix to the seventeenth Stricture on the Examen, how very far I am from any such opinion. And since Dr. Tully has thought fit both here and elsewhere, to go beyond the limits of the present controversy, he cannot object if we do the same, by bringing to the test, besides those points of his teaching which are heterodox on the article of Justification, some others also of his tenets which are not quite satisfactory: and this we will do in Section VII. Meanwhile we have in the next place to examine what foreign reformed Churches teach concerning the present question.

Justif. Paul. p. 25, 26.

Thes. 3. [§ 6. p. 161.]

SECTION VI.

ON CHAPTER IV.—ON THE JUDGMENT OF FOREIGN CHURCHES WHICH ARE CALLED REFORMED.

SECT. VI. παῤῥησίαν

§ 1. Dr. Tully here says that the Harmonist's boldness is extraordinary, (he had called it a 'manifest calumny' in the heading of the chapter,) in that in the sixth chapter of his first Dissertation he flatly, and as it were from an oracle, thus pronounces concerning the judgment of foreign Churches. "It is clear that they all, or at least the principal, are in a manner professedly on our side of the question"—and presently he exclaims, "Alas! for his good faith"—then, as is his custom, he abuses the Harmonist. But concerning the Harmonist's good faith in this point, we will leave it to the free judgment of all who have the love of truth at heart. We make two assertions. 1. That the expression "we are justified by faith only," in the view of the old Protestants is taken altogether figuratively, so that grace, which answers to it, is to be understood in the word faith, and so then to be justified by faith only is the same as to be justified by grace only, and not by the merit of works. 2. In the same expression the necessity of true repentance for obtaining remission of sins or justification, is by no means excluded. We constantly affirm, that on these two points, (which are sufficient for our purpose,) at least the principal and most celebrated of the reformed Confessions entirely agree with us. Such is our assertion.

ch. vi. 1. p. 32.

§ 2. Now, omitting Dr. Tully's rhetorical effusions, which "are only got up for deceiving the unskilful, the sciolists, and the incautious," (I use his own words,) let us see what solid arguments are brought forward by him. He thus proceeds: "But this, he says, he has shewn more fully in ch. xviii. But what does he shew there? 1st. That the Church of England is on his side. But I think I have done away with this calumny in the former chapter, (an impudent one indeed it is, and would that the indignity of the thing would allow of a milder expression.") But whether the Harmonist or Dr. Tully himself is guilty of the impudent calumny, (if indeed the indignity of the thing allows not of a milder

Justif. Paul. p. 179.

ibid. p. 29.

SECT. VI.

word,) let any one judge who will not think it amiss to compare both what I have said in this eighteenth chapter of the second Dissertation, and also in the Examen in the answer to the last Stricture, as well as in the preceding Section of this Apology, and what shall be said in the following one, with those things which Dr. Tully has brought forward on the opposite side in the third chapter of his work.

§ 3. Dr. Tully now hastens on to the Augsburg Confession. Where, in the first place, he finds fault with me because I called that the greatest of all the reformed Confessions, not excepting even our own Anglican one. But what is the harmless word that ill-feeling and envy will not find fault with? I only said the same thing that many learned men both of our own and foreign countries have said before me, and who also highly honoured our Church. Now the Augsburg Confession is deservedly called the greatest for more than one reason. In the first place, (not to say any thing of its most excellent and learned principal author Ph. Melancthon,) it was the first of all the Confessions. Next, at the time when it was published, it was approved of by the consent of almost all, if not of all the reformed Churches, Universities, and Doctors. Lastly, it is still received and held in certain kingdoms, and great principalities and free states. The Doctor, moreover, is offended, because I said that the heads of our Church had followed and imitated this Confession. But what can be clearer than this? The first article of our Confession is taken almost word for word from the first of the Augsburg. Our second is clearly copied from the third of Augsburg. Also the sixteenth in ours (which most of all grieves the Doctor, and those who think with him) openly imitates, towards the end, the anathemas of the eleventh in the Augsburg, as our twenty-fifth does the thirteenth in the Augsburg. Again, in our Homilies how often must the attentive reader who is acquainted with Melancthon's writings, hear him speaking! Add to which, (what I shall soon have occasion to put before the reader,) that Hooper, of blessed memory, (who was present at the Synod from whence our Articles and the first book of Homilies come, and whom some of the Homilies especially claim as their author, so marked are they by his style,) was in the

habit of copying long passages from Melancthon's writings, almost word for word. But I miss either the Doctor's good judgment or his fairness, when he says that "he does not at all wish to detract any thing from the very orthodox Confession of Augsburg." Now, if he really does not, some things must be taken out of his Catechism, inasmuch as they evidently are at variance with the Augsburg, as also with the Anglican Confession, which shall be clearly proved in the following Section. SECT. VI. Justif. Paul. p. 30.

§ 4. Meanwhile let us proceed with the Doctor. "But what," says he, "does this greatest of all his Confessions lay down? Why, if we believe him, that repentance is altogether necessary for justification." Truly this is a grievous crime in me, who have dared to assign to the Augsburg divines so pernicious a doctrine, namely, one which is asserted by the Prophets, by Christ and His Apostles, by all the Doctors of the ancient Catholic Church, and in short by all sound Protestants. And yet Dr. Tully has arrived at such a pitch of confidence, that he is not afraid to stake the whole fortune of his cause on this point. His words are, "Let there be brought forward, even one syllable in the Confession, which looks that way," (namely, to prove that true contrition is necessary for justification,) "and we will own ourselves conquered." Who would wish for a more easy opponent? we accept his terms, promising ourselves certain victory. Let the whole of the passage in the Augsburg Confession be quoted, (which in the Harmony I have for brevity's sake only quoted in part,) and it will soon be seen how plainly Dr. Tully betrays his own cause. Its words are; "In the first place then, they (the Churches) thus teach concerning faith and justification. Christ fitly comprehends the whole sum of the Gospel, when in the last chapter of St. Luke He orders that repentance and remission of sins should be preached in His name. For the Gospel convicts of sin, and requires repentance, and at the same time offers remission of sins freely for Christ's sake, and not for our worthiness. And as the preaching of repentance is universal, so also is the promise of grace; it bids all men believe, and receive the benefits of Christ. As Christ says, 'Come unto Me all ye that are heavy laden,' &c., and St. Paul says, 'He is rich to all,' &c. Aug. Confess. art. 21. de Fide.

SECT. VI.

Although then some contrition is necessary, still it is to be believed that remission of sins is given us, and we are made righteous of unrighteous, reconciled or accepted and sons of God, freely for Christ's sake, not for the worthiness of our contrition, or for any other of our former or subsequent works." It is in vain for Dr. Tully to contend that a repentance not saving, such as was Judas', is meant here. For, is repentance like that of Judas necessary for man's salvation? Besides, the Augsburg Confession gathers the necessity of repentance, of which it is speaking, from the words of our Lord in the last chapter of St. Luke, where He bids repentance and remission of sins to be preached in His name. But, is our Saviour speaking of a repentance to be repented of, such as was Judas'? or does He join remission of sins to such a repentance as this? I am ashamed, for the Doctor's sake, of such a comment. Let us hear too the fourth article of the Augsburg Confession, which runs thus: "But that we may obtain the benefits of Christ, namely, remission of sins, justification, and life eternal, Christ has given us the Gospel, in which these benefits are held out to us, as it is written in the last of St. Luke, that repentance and remission of sins be preached in His name amongst all nations. For since all men born in the natural way have sin, and are unable truly to satisfy the law of God, the Gospel convicts of sin, and shews to us Christ as a Mediator, and thus teaches us concerning remission of sins. When the Gospel convicts us of our sins, our terrified hearts should be convinced that remission of sins and justification by faith are freely given us for Christ's sake, by which faith we ought to believe and confess that these are given us for Christ's sake, Who was made a victim for us, and appeased the Father. Although therefore the Gospel requires repentance, yet, that remission of sins may be certain, it teaches that it is freely given, that is, does not depend on any condition of our worthiness, nor is given us for any of our former works, or the worthiness of such as follow." Where it is taught clearly enough, that that repentance required in the Gospel, which without doubt is none other but a real and saving repentance, is required for the remission of sins, that is, the justification of man.

§ 5. In the mean time, it does not escape me that the

Augsburg divines have somewhat nicely divided repentance into two parts, contrition and faith, and have explained that former act of repentance in a different way to that in which it has hitherto been explained. Cassander long ago observed this, in his Consultation, in the following words: "As to what is subjoined in the book of the Augsburg Confession, namely, that this repentance consists of contrition and faith, and that fruits worthy of repentance ought to follow it; this is new in this division of repentance, that faith is joined to the parts of repentance, confession being passed over, and put after contrition; and this in such a way as that contrition is explained contrary to the received opinion of the Church. For the terrors and fears of the wounded conscience on the acknowledgment of sin, are not meant when we speak of contrition, but contrition proceeds from these terrors; and by contrition is understood sorrow for our sin on account of God's being offended, with the purpose of abstaining from it, which sorrow is informed by the grace of God, and proceeds not only from fear of Divine judgment, but from faith in the Divine word, and a confidence of obtaining pardon. But if by contrition any kind of sorrow for sin caused by the terror of the law be meant, such sorrow, since it precedes true and saving repentance, is not wont to be reckoned among the parts of repentance, and has been used to be called rather by the name of 'attrition' than 'contrition.' Although contrition of this kind is called 'repentance,' or 'change of mind,' to which, for it to be efficacious or saving, faith or confidence of mercy must be added, as the examples of Cain and Judas manifestly prove."

SECT. VI.

ad Art. 12. apud Grot. Via ad pac., p. 92.

informatus

resipiscentia

§ 6. Nevertheless, it is certain that the Augsburg Divines taught that that contrition which is made true and saving by faith, by which, namely, we gain a true hatred of sin, love of righteousness, and a firm purpose of a new life, is necessary for receiving remission of sins or justification. Who could more thoroughly understand the meaning and sense of the Augsburg Confession than Melancthon, who composed it? Let us hear then his own plain explanation, as he has given it in the following words[k]. "There was no faith in the con-

[k] Loc. Theol. de Fide in Corp. Christian. Doctrin. p. 335, 336. [vol. i. p. 247. Op. ed. 1562.]

SECT. VI.

trition of Judas, and so, oppressed by despair, he rushed into eternal destruction: on the contrary, in Peter's contrition, there was faith: and so he rose again from his great grief. And when we are lifted up by faith, the remembrance of the goodness of God comes upon us, and we are not only distressed by the fear of punishment, but with a purer sorrow for having offended God, to Whom we owe gratitude and obedience. But there is no need to refine upon these affections, God wills that we should fear His wrath, and that it should be seen in punishment. But let faith be added, and let us not fly from God, but return to Him and seek to be received, and be sure that it is God's everlasting and immutable will, to receive those cast down with fear who believe that pardon is granted them for the sake of their Mediator. This He bids us believe and hold. This faith makes a great difference between servile and filial fear. The former is without faith, and actually flies from God: but filial fear is a terror mixed with faith, which elevates and consoles the mind in the midst of its fears, approaches God, and seeks and obtains remission. This description is plain, and can be understood in our practice. Contrition without faith, is a horrible dread and anguish of the soul flying from God, as in Saul and Judas: but contrition with faith is the dread and anguish of the soul not flying from God, but acknowledging His just wrath, truly sorrowing for having neglected and despised Him, but yet coming to Him and imploring pardon. Such sorrow as this becomes a good work and a sacrifice, as says the Psalmist: 'The sacrifice of God is a troubled spirit: a broken and contrite heart, O God, shalt Thou not despise.' And yet we must censure and reject that opinion which has pretended that men merited remission of their sins by their contrition, or that remission is given them for the worthiness of their contrition, &c." What can be plainer than this? He clearly recognises the necessity of true contrition for receiving justification, while he altogether rejects the merit of contrition in the work of justification.

Justif. Paul. p. 31, 32.

§ 7. We may now very easily refute those minute bits of sophistry by which Dr. Tully presently persuades us that the divines of Augsburg, notwithstanding this manifest avowal of their opinion given by themselves, did not mean that true

contrition preceded justification. The sum of what he says is, that the fruits and effects of faith do not precede justification, for then they would precede faith itself, and so the effect would be prior to the cause; and repentance and contrition, according to the Augsburg divines, are the effects and fruits of faith. I answer: They do indeed teach that true repentance and contrition are the effects and fruits of that faith which justifies, but they no less clearly teach that faith is not justifying until it produce these fruits and effects. This is clear from those words of Melancthon, "Filial fear is dread mixed with faith, which elevates and consoles the soul in the midst of its fears, approaches God, seeks and obtains remission." Consider then. Fear becomes filial by the addition of faith: by that faith the sinner approaches God, implores remission, and in this way at length receives it, that is, is justified. Therefore, although, according to the Augsburg Confession, the approaching God and the sincere and earnest prayer for pardon, (which constitute true repentance,) are the effects of that faith which justifies, yet they precede remission of sins or justification, and without them that justification or remission is not obtained. The same thing is meant by these words: "Contrition with faith is the dread and anguish of the soul not flying from God, but acknowledging His just wrath, truly sorrowing for having neglected and despised Him, but yet coming to Him and imploring pardon. Such sorrow becomes a good work and a sacrifice," &c. What can be plainer? Contrition before faith is an anguish which flies from God: but joined to faith it becomes the anguish of the soul, acknowledging God's just wrath, truly sorrowing, and coming to Him to implore pardon; thus it is made that sacrifice of which the Psalmist speaks, 'The sacrifice of God is a troubled spirit, a broken and contrite heart, O God, shalt Thou not despise.' In a word then, according to the Augsburg divines, true contrition or repentance is not the effect of justifying faith, as such, but belongs to its very essence: that is, faith is not justifying which has not yet produced true contrition or repentance.

SECT. VI.

§ 8. Dr. Tully goes on to the Confession of Wurtemberg, as quoted by us. "Of the same stamp also," he says, "are the arguments urged by him from the Wurtemberg Confes-

Justif. Paul. p.33.

SECT. VI.

sion, but really so unsuccessfully, that a more deadly blow could not have been given to our opponent's cause, thus smitten as it were under the fifth rib. Let us hear the words from the chapter on Justification. 'We believe that for doing and exercising righteousness these virtues are necessary, faith, hope and charity, &c.' See, 'for doing and exercising righteousness,' that is, for other good works. For it does not say for justification: for the most ignorant would not allow that a 'man makes and exercises his justification.'" But we constantly miss fairness in the Doctor, when he quotes the words of others. The words of the Confession are these: "We believe and confess that for doing and exercising righteousness acceptable to God, these virtues are necessary, faith, hope, and charity, &c." The plain meaning of which is, that no one without these virtues can be acceptable to God unto salvation: and what is this, I ask, but that no one can be justified without these virtues? Again, the Wurtembergians make hope and charity of the same necessity as faith, and no one doubts but that they acknowledged faith as requisite for the justification of man. Lastly, it is plain that the necessity of these virtues, faith, hope, and charity, are acknowledged by the Wurtemberg divines in the same relation in which the merit of these same is denied by them. But the merit which they take away from these virtues, has reference to the work of justification, and so the conclusion is obvious. The words of the Confession are clear: "We believe and confess that for doing and exercising righteousness acceptable to God, these virtues are necessary, faith, hope, charity, &c. But we consider that their opinion is most widely opposed to the true apostolic and Catholic doctrine, who teach that man is made acceptable to God, and is accounted just before God, on account of these virtues, and that at the judgment of God he must trust to the merits of these virtues." We have not time at present to recite the absurd argument which Dr. Tully here puts in his opponent's mouth. If any one can be taken with such witticisms as these, let him be so.

§ 9. Dr. Tully closes this chapter by quoting many proofs from the Confessions of other foreign Churches. To all of which I answer, that although I never took upon myself to

bring forward whatever might be said in every Confession on this subject, (for I only affirmed that at least the earliest and greatest of the reformed Confessions were on our side,) yet whoever, not contented with the mutilated fragments quoted by Dr. Tully, shall look into the Confessions themselves, and examine the entire opinion of each on this subject, he will confess with me that they, one and all, reject the merit of any virtue from the work of justification, but plainly acknowledge the necessity of true repentance for obtaining justification: which is sufficient for our purpose. But if there is any reformed Confession opposed to this opinion, that one must be without doubt rejected as contrary on this point to the Scriptures and Catholic consent. SECT. VI.

§ 10. But this is by no means to be passed over, that the Strasburg Confession is quoted by Dr. Tully as favouring his opinion, than which nothing can be more opposite. He himself observes that the states of Constance, Memmingin, and Lindau, subscribed to this Confession, and also that it was presented, together with the Augsburg, to His Imperial Majesty (Charles the Fifth), and therefore must have been drawn up with some caution and moderation, if any difficulty pressed upon them in that controversy. Let us now hear the words of this celebrated Confession. "But we are unwilling that this" (namely, what had just been said about justification by faith only) "should be so understood as if we placed salvation and righteousness in the idle cogitations of the soul, or in faith void of love, which they call uninformed, since we are sure that no one can be righteous or in a state of salvation unless he love God supremely, and most earnestly imitate Him. 'For whom He did foreknow, He also did predestinate to be conformed to the image of His Son:' as in the glory of a blessed life so in the exercise of innocence and the highest righteousness: 'for we are His workmanship, created unto good works.' Now no one can love God above all things, and imitate Him with a worthy zeal, unless he plainly knows Him, and as Him from whom he may promise to himself the greatest blessings. Therefore we cannot in any other way be justified, that is, come as well into a state of salvation as into a state of righteousness, (for righteousness is itself our salvation,) than, having faith given us by

Justif. Paul. p. 35, 36.

cap. 4.

SECT. VI.

which we believe the Gospel, and persuaded that God has adopted us to be His sons, and will for ever shew us His paternal loving kindness, depend wholly on His will. St. Augustine in his work on Faith and Works calls this faith 'evangelical,' that is, faith made efficacious by love." The Strasburg Confession plainly teaches us three things. 1. That the idea of righteousness or justification, and of salvation, is the same: to be justified, is to come in a state of salvation as well as of righteousness, nay, that righteousness is our salvation itself: and so that whatever is required for salvation is equally required for righteousness. 2. That that love by which a man loves God supremely and above all things is altogether necessary for the righteousness and salvation of man. 3. That it follows from the necessity of love, that faith also is necessary for the righteousness and salvation of man: inasmuch as without that faith, by which we are persuaded of the Divine mercy revealed to us in the Gospel, it is not possible for any one to love God above all things. What does Dr. Tully say to all this? He contends that the meaning of the Strasburg divines is, "that this love of God is the fruit of faith, and follows, not precedes, justification." But what can be more barefaced than such an interpretation? The Strasburg divines plainly mean that the love of God is an indispensable condition for any one to obtain righteousness and salvation. For they do not say that no one is righteous unless he love God above all things, which words might admit of the Doctor's interpretation, but that "no one can possibly become righteous unless he love God above all things," which is entirely contrary to his meaning. With equal reason might Dr. Tully affirm that the Strasburg divines meant that love of God is consequent to, and not antecedent to salvation, when they clearly teach that the idea of righteousness and salvation of man is the same. Equally, too, might it be said that faith even, according to them, was consequent upon righteousness and salvation, not antecedent to them: for they argue the necessity of faith for obtaining righteousness and salvation (as we have just remarked) from the necessity of love for obtaining the same benefit, as if they established their point by some such process as the following: If the love of God above all things

is necessary for obtaining righteousness or salvation, then faith also is necessary for the same, but the antecedent is true, therefore also the consequent is: they prove the consequence of the major in this way, that the love of God cannot exist in a man without faith, and thus the thing is self-evident. Lastly, the Strasburg divines expressly say that we cannot be justified or become righteous in any other way than by first having faith given us, by which we depend wholly on the will of God, that is, are ready and prepared to obey God in all things. From this one specimen the wary reader may conjecture how much confidence is to be placed in the good judgment or straightforwardness of Dr. Tully when he quotes or explains the rest of the reformed Confessions. SECT. VI.

SECTION VII.

BEING AN APPENDIX TO THE PRECEDING SECTION.

§ 1. I confess that when I read the three preceding chapters of Dr. Tully's work, I could not help thinking of that line of the poet,

Quis tulerit Gracchos, &c.

for the reverend gentleman who has been so severe against us undeservingly, (as it now appears), as corrupters of the doctrine of the Church, is himself found in some points to have opposed certain clear definitions, both of the English, and other reformed Churches, and of the Catholic Church as well. And to prove this point we shall devote the whole of this Section, which we expect will be of a considerable length. We do not this, however, merely as a retaliation upon the Doctor: (that were a mean object:) but we have thought it worth while, since an opportunity offers itself, to assert and illustrate the true, genuine, and Catholic doctrine of our Church, (now well-nigh lost through the badness of the times,) on certain very important points of Christian religion.

§ 2. First then, Dr. Tully openly asserts that "repent-

SECT. VII.

ance, or true contrition for sin, is in no way necessary to obtain the first justification." We have frequently mentioned this, and have brought forward passages where he expressly gives this opinion, (a shameful one, indeed, and unworthy of a Church of England divine,) and, moreover, supports it with arguments. It has also been proved above how opposed Dr. Tully is in this to the Holy Scriptures, the Fathers of the ancient Church, and to the Confessions of foreign reformed Churches, and we have also adduced by the way certain testimonies of our Church which are sufficiently at variance with this new dogma. Nevertheless, eager to vindicate our holy mother from so base an error, irreverently ascribed to her by Dr. Tully, I have been induced to attempt a fuller refutation of it from our Homilies and Liturgy.

§ 3. There is in the second book of the Homilies, one with this title, Of Repentance and True Reconciliation to God. Where the title itself clearly teaches us that repentance is the mean or absolutely necessary condition for our true reconciliation with God; and what is this but our justification? The writer of the Homily continually asserts that it is impossible for us to please God, to return into His favour, or to escape His wrath without repentance. If it be asked of what kind of repentance the Homily is speaking, this is explained in several places. In the first part of the Homily the writer shews from the Prophet Joel that the whole work of repentance can be reduced to these four heads. 1. From whence. 2. To whom. 3. By whom. 4. The manner how we must return. This last point he explains as follows. "Fourthly, this holy Prophet Joel doth lively express the manner of this our returning on repentance, comprehending all the inward and outward things that may be here observed. First, he will have us return to God with our whole heart, whereby he doth remove and put away all hypocrisy, lest the same might be justly said unto us; 'This people draweth near unto Me with their mouth, and worshippeth Me with their lips, but their heart is far off from Me.' Secondly, he requireth a sincere and pure love of godliness, and of the true worshipping and service of God, that is to say, that, forsaking

[Hom. B. 2. p. 47. 1.]

Is. 29. 13.

Mat. 15. 8, 9.

all manner of things that are repugnant and contrary to God's will, we do give our hearts unto Him, and the whole strength of our bodies and souls, according to that which is written in the law; 'Thou shalt love the Lord thy God, with all thy heart, with all thy soul, and with all thy might.' Here, therefore, nothing is left unto us that we may give unto the world, and unto the lusts of the flesh. For sith that the heart is the fountain of all our works, as many as do with their whole heart turn unto the Lord, do live unto Him only. Neither do they yet repent truly, that halting on both sides, do other whiles obey God, but by and by do think that laying Him aside it is lawful for them to serve the world and the flesh." In the second part of the same Homily, true repentance necessary for reconciliation with God is thus described; as "a true returning unto God, whereby men forsaking their idolatry and wickedness, do with a lively faith embrace, love, and worship the true and living God only, and give themselves to all manner of good works, which by God's word they know to be acceptable unto Him." Soon after the author enumerates the parts of this repentance, "which, being set together, may be likened to an easy and short ladder, whereby we may climb from the bottomless pit of perdition up into the castle or tower of eternal and endless salvation." He makes these parts to be four; genuine contrition of heart, sincere confession of sin, a true confidence in Christ our Mediator, and a firm purpose of a new life. Of the first, he teaches from David, that it is the only sacrifice we can offer pleasing and acceptable to God. Of the second, he shews also from David that if we confess our sins with a sorrowful and contrite heart, God will freely forgive them. And lastly, of the fourth he expressly teaches us, that "if we will have the wrath of God to be pacified, we must in no wise dissemble, but turn unto Him again, with a true and sound repentance, which may be known and declared by good fruits, as by most sure and infallible signs thereof." And presently he does not shrink from saying, that "the satisfaction which God doth require from us, is that we cease from evil, and do good." Surely nothing can be clearer and more explicit than these passages.

SECT. VII.

Deut. 6. 5.

[p. 477.]

[p. 483.]

SECT. VII.

§ 4. From the Homilies let us turn to our Liturgy. Almost in the very beginning of it, the form of Absolution is ordered to be pronounced by the Priest daily at Morning and Evening Prayer. It is there said, that "God hath given power and commandment to His ministers, to declare and pronounce to His people, being penitent, the absolution and remission of their sins. He (that is, God) pardoneth and absolveth all them that truly repent, and unfeignedly believe His Holy Gospel," that is, He justifies them. Agreeable to this is the Absolution to be said by the Priest, turning himself to the people, before the participation of the Lord's Supper: its words are, "Almighty God, our heavenly Father, Who of His great mercy hath promised forgiveness of sins to all them that with hearty repentance and true faith turn unto him; Have mercy upon you: pardon and deliver you from all your sins," &c. The Collect for the Wednesday after Quinquagesima Sunday, commonly called Ash Wednesday, which is used daily in Lent, is, "Almighty and everlasting God, Who hatest nothing that Thou hast made, and dost forgive the sins of all them that are penitent: create and make in us new and contrite hearts, that we worthily lamenting our sins and acknowledging our wretchedness, may obtain of Thee, the God of all mercy, perfect remission and forgiveness; through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen." In the Office called a Commination appointed for the same day, the Priest, after having recited God's cursings against impenitent sinners taken out of the Law, is ordered thus to address the people: "Now seeing that all they are accursed (as the Prophet David beareth witness) who do err and go astray from the commandments of God, let us (remembering the dreadful judgment hanging over our heads, and always ready to fall upon us) return unto our Lord God, with all contrition and meekness of heart; bewailing and lamenting our sinful life, acknowledging and confessing our offences, and seeking to bring forth worthy fruits of penance. 'For now is the axe put to the root of the trees, &c.' Let us not abuse the goodness of God Who calleth us mercifully to amendment, and of His endless pity promiseth us forgiveness of that which is past, if with a perfect and true heart we return unto Him; 'For though our sins be as red as scarlet, they shall be made

white as snow, &c.' Let us therefore return unto Him Who is the merciful receiver of all true penitent sinners; assuring ourselves that He is ready to receive us, and most willing to pardon us if we come unto Him with faithful repentance, if we submit ourselves unto Him," &c. Surely in all these passages the words are so clear that they cannot want any deductions or observations from us, in order to be made plainer. He must be in more than Cimmerian darkness who does not at once perceive how constant is the teaching of our Church, that true contrition for sin, and a thorough conversion of the heart to God, is the absolute condition for obtaining remission of sins, and the acceptance of God, that is, for justification. And they who have not yet learned this doctrine of the Christian religion, or who have unlearnt it, must be sent back to our Catechism. The child is asked concerning the sacrament of Baptism, "What is required of persons to be baptized?" and is taught to answer, "Repentance, whereby they forsake sin; and faith, whereby they stedfastly believe the promises of God made to them in that sacrament." Now surely, to say that not only faith, but repentance also is required for receiving the grace of Baptism, is the same as saying that repentance, as well as faith, is requisite for justification, as has already been proved above, and to any one in his senses must be sufficiently plain of itself.

SECT. VII.

sec. iv. 9.

§ 5. And now, if any one is desirous to know what is the teaching of the approved divines of our Church on this point, (alas, that a principle of the Christian and indeed of all religion should be called in question by a Christian!) they all with one voice preach the necessity of repentance for remission of sins, that is, for justification. I will quote three great witnesses who may answer not only for themselves, but for all divines both of our own and all reformed Churches. We have already heard the learned Field asserting that this is the common doctrine of the ancient Fathers, and of all Protestants; that the works of preventing grace comprehended in the word 'conversion' are absolutely required in a man, so that he may be disposed and prepared by the same, to receive the grace of justification; which that great divine again declares more expressly in the same chapter, when, on Stapleton objecting against Protestants,

Append. ad lib. iii. de Eccles. p. 298.

SECT. VII.

that they taught that our justification consisted in the remission of sins by faith only, but that the sacraments did not avail towards it, he replies, not without some indignation, "And this too is false: for their teaching is plainly otherwise: namely, that Baptism and repentance are of necessity required for a man's first justification." With him agrees also the learned Francis White, who in his 'Answer to Fisher,' a Jesuit, who objected against us that we reject the sacrament of penance and of priestly absolution, which is the necessary means for obtaining remission of sins committed after Baptism, says, "The objector, by penance, understandeth not repentance as it is a virtue, for Protestants believe true repentance to be a second table after spiritual shipwreck, and a necessary means of remission of sins committed after Baptism." This he proves in the margin from Calvin, Beza, and Zanchius, whose words he quotes. "We believe that repentance is necessary for the true partaking of the righteousness of Christ, and so for communion with Christ, by which repentance we return from our sins and the world to Christ, with a change of heart and will, we are joined to him, and so obtain remission of sins in Him and by Him." The great Morton defends the same doctrine in his clear treatise called, 'A Catholic Appeal for Protestants,' where, amongst other ways, he thus meets his opponent who charges the reformed with the Solifidianism of ancient heretics. "They" (that is, the reformed) "require a living faith and a serious repentance, without which no man can be justified." And he confirms this in the margin by this most remarkable confession of Bellarmine himself. "These and the like proofs shew clearly that something is required in us in order that we may be justified, nor can our opponents deny this, who, although they say that remission does not depend on any condition of works, and that neither repentance or faith, or any act of ours is the meritorious cause of our justification, yet do not deny that faith and repentance, yea lively faith, and a serious repentance are required, and that without these no one can be justified." It would be easy, if it were necessary, to add many other proofs from other authors, but let us rather proceed to some others of the Doctor's unorthodox tenets.

p. 185, 186.

De Relig. c. 18. thes. 1.

lib. 5. c. 16. sect. 3. 1.

Bell. de Just. iii. c. 6. [vol. iv. Op. p. 1110.]

§ 6. Secondly, Dr. Tully teaches that "the continuation or preservation of our justification, which has been already obtained by faith only, in no wise depends on the condition of good works being performed by us for the future." He studiously inculcates this, by far the most dangerous of his dogmas, throughout his whole work. For he every where asserts that all the works which follow justifying faith contribute nothing towards a man's justification; and he laughs at their folly who think otherwise. He leans on this supposition, that a man already justified cannot possibly be further justified, or that the first justification is absolute, which I have frequently shewn to be absurd. Moreover he expressly denies that obedience to God's commands is a condition of our justification, and then he shews what a condition is, namely, that whereon the effect of a transaction, or (as others have it) a disposition depends, and then proceeds to argue against his opponents in the following way. "Hence, therefore, all notions of justification depending on the condition of works fall to the ground: for we prove it thus: if good works are the condition of the justification we are speaking of, then justification depends on them: but this is impossible, therefore they are not the condition of justification." The minor proposition of which argument he proves from all works which precede the first justification having the nature of sin: and that those works which follow the first justification should contribute any thing towards it, is, as he says, a flat contradiction. Nay, a little while after he boldly denies that good works are the conditions, properly so called, of obtaining salvation. His words are: "We briefly and openly deny that even the most excellent works of man are the conditions, properly so called, of obtaining glory; since before works, that is, in justification itself, the faithful enjoy this right to eternal salvation." Let us now see how well this theology of the Doctor's agrees with the doctrine of the Church of England, as expressly laid down in the Homilies and Articles. In the Homily on Salvation, towards the end of the first part, the Church expressly teaches (as I have also shewn above) that because the first justification is obtained by faith, joined with the internal virtues of hope, love, repentance, &c. that on that account the righteousness

SECT. VII.

Just. Paul. p. 154.

p. 169.

p. 172, 173.

SECT. VII.

of works to be performed of necessity afterwards is in no wise excluded: and what sort of necessity there is for those good works following the first justification is explained in the Homily on Good Works, part the first, near the end, where the author of the Homily quotes and approves of the words of St. Chrysostom on the believing thief; "If he had lived and not regarded faith and the works thereof, he should have lost his salvation again." But what need of many words? Our Church in the sixteenth article expressly teaches that "a man after he have received the Holy Ghost may depart from grace given and fall into sin, deadly sin;" so that he must be blinding his eyes to the mid-day sun, who does not perceive that our Church holds that the continuation or preservation of our justification entirely depends on the condition of good works being afterwards performed by us; which, however, our reverend antagonist strenuously denies. Let us proceed.

§ 7. Dr. Tully in the third place teaches that "a man once imbued with justifying faith, cannot possibly entirely fall away from it or perish everlastingly." He even thrusts this dogma (than which hardly any can be more dangerous) into his Catechism or Enchiridion as an undoubted principle of the Christian religion, to be believed by candidates in divinity. For in the ninth chapter on faith, after he has divided faith into four kinds, namely, miraculous, historical, temporaneous, and justifying, he goes on to teach how these three former species of faith are distinguished from justifying faith, namely, both in their principle as in their subject. And treating of this latter difference, he thus instructs his catechumen. *A.* "Tell me the different subjects." *B.* "The subject of justifying faith is a man elected to life and born of God. The subjects of the other kinds of faith may be sons of perdition, hypocrites, &c." So that according to the Doctor's divinity, whoever is once endued with justifying faith, is chosen by God to life eternal in such a way that he never can become the son of perdition. I allow indeed that Dr. Tully has not a few nor insignificant of our divines as his leaders in this error, namely, those who flourished in those times when by certain men's artifices, who were greatly given to the theology of Geneva, things had got to such a state that it was scarcely lawful to interpret either the decrees of our

Church or even the Scriptures themselves otherwise than according to the standard of Calvin's Institutes. And therefore their error must be pardoned, on account of the times in which they lived. Indeed every age, as some one has excellently observed, has as it were its own flood of opinions, to which if any one oppose himself, he is either carried along by it, or overwhelmed. Nor were there wanting all that time grave and learned men in our Church, who dared openly to oppose the growing error. But, however these things may be, I do not doubt but that I shall easily persuade any one, who is not incurably prejudiced, that this doctrine of Dr. Tully, which he sends forth as with oracular authority, is altogether at variance both with the decrees of our own Church and with the best of the Confessions of foreign reformed Churches, and finally, with the judgment of all Catholic antiquity. SECT. VII.

§ 8. First, then, the opinion of the English Church on Perseverance is clearly expressed in the sixteenth article in these words. "Not every deadly sin willingly committed after Baptism is sin against the Holy Ghost, and unpardonable. Wherefore the grant of repentance is not to be denied to such as fall into sin after Baptism. After we have received the Holy Ghost, we may depart from grace given and fall into sin, and by the grace of God we may arise again, and amend our lives. And therefore, they are to be condemned which say they can no more sin as long as they live here, or deny the place of forgiveness to such as truly repent." On which the learned prelate Overall rightly observes that that sin by which we are said to depart from grace, is called in the beginning of the article, "deadly sin willingly committed." The preceding article, the fifteenth, in fact treats of daily sins which are common to all regenerate persons, in which we offend all, the grace within us remaining still safe, and we not departing from it. But this sixteenth article treats of deadly sin by which a man departs from grace given, after having received the Holy Ghost and Baptism, and continues so until his recovery by means of repentance. But that our Church conceives that this departing from grace may be 'final' as it is called, may be clearly gathered from the fact that the article is evidently speaking of the recovery of those

SECT. VII.

fallen into deadly sins, by means of repentance, as of a contingent thing which might indeed take place, but which also might not. "We may depart," it says, "from grace given, and we may arise again and amend our lives." For who in his senses, and free from party spirit, will imagine that the heads of our Church meant to say, even if they themselves believed it or wished that others should, that the recovery by repentance of all those who once had been true believers, and had afterwards departed from grace given through grievous sins, was certain and infallible? What grammar, I ask, (to use the Doctor's expressions,) will bear this meaning: "we may again arise and amend our lives," that is, "we certainly shall arise and repent?"

§ 9. If any person is not satisfied with these passages, let him consult the book of Homilies, which was put forth at the same time as our Articles were, and confirmed by the authority of the same Synod. Our Church there so often and so explicitly gives her opinion concerning the defectibility of justifying faith, that I have often wondered how it was possible for so many learned and intelligent men, who, it is probable, must have read the Homilies over and over again, to be ignorant of it. In the first book there is a whole Homily of the danger of falling from God, the sole end and object of which is to shew that a man may, after having received grace, fall away from the same and perish, and that therefore all men should carefully beware of the danger of so terrible a falling away. In the first part of this Homily we read, "For whereas, God hath shewed to all them that truly believe His Gospel, His face of mercy in Jesus Christ, which doth so lighten their hearts, that they (if they behold it as they ought to do) be transformed to His image, be made partakers of the heavenly light and of His Holy Spirit, and be fashioned to Him in all goodness requisite to the children of God: so if they after do neglect the same, if they be unthankful to Him, if they order not their lives according to His example and doctrine, and to the setting forth of His glory, He will take away from them His kingdom, His holy word, whereby He should reign in them, because they bring not forth the fruit thereof that He looketh for. Nevertheless He is so merciful, and of so long sufferance that He doth not

Hom. i. [p. 74, 75.]

shew upon us that great wrath suddenly. But when we begin to shrink from His word, not believing it, or not expressing it in our livings: first He doth send His messengers, the true preachers of His word, to admonish and warn us of our duty &c. And if this will not serve, but still we remain disobedient to His word and will, not knowing Him, not loving Him, not fearing Him, not putting our whole trust and confidence in Him; and on the other side to our neighbours, behaving ourselves uncharitably, by disdain, envy, malice, or by committing murder, robbery, adultery, gluttony, deceit, lying, swearing, or other like detestable works and ungodly behaviour, then He threateneth us by terrible comminations, swearing in great anger that 'whosoever doth these works shall never enter into His rest,' which is the kingdom of heaven." In which passage the writer of the Homily is speaking of those who truly believe the Gospel, are transformed to the image of God, are made partakers of the heavenly light and of the Holy Spirit, and are fashioned to all goodness requisite for the children of God: and yet of the very same persons he no less clearly teaches that if they are ungrateful to God after such great blessings &c., He will take from them His kingdom. It is in vain to recur to that old piece of sophistry, (which Dr. Tully makes use of in a question not unlike the present,) "that no supposition goes any way towards proving reality: for instance; If Caius is an animal without reason, he will be a brute: does not in any wise prove this, that Caius can be an animal without reason." For in the first place, the author, in the beginning and at the end, and through the whole Homily, urges most vehemently upon his hearers, threatens them, thunders in their ears, beseeches and implores them by every thing that is sacred, to be exceeding careful lest they fall away from grace given, and so perish everlastingly. And therefore he never could have thought he was bringing forward the supposition of an impossibility. It would certainly be most absurd and senseless to urge upon Caius, in a long and earnest speech, that he should anxiously beware lest, by losing his reason, he should become (properly speaking) a brute. Such a metamorphosis as this poetry itself has scarcely admitted. And secondly, the words which have been quoted most plainly shew the possi-

SECT. VII.

Heb. 3. Ps. 15. 1 Cor. 6.

SECT. VII.

bility and not unfrequent occurrence of persons truly regenerated by Christ, and endued with justifying faith, falling away for ever from the kingdom of God, through ingratitude and continued contempt of Divine grace. In fact, the author of the Homily describes the very way which the Lord is wont to use towards these most wretched apostates, as it were gradually and step by step. For he teaches us that the most merciful God does not pour forth His anger upon ungrateful men suddenly, nor does He desert them for ever, who have deserted Him, but that He tries every remedy before He cuts off the putrefying members from the body of Christ: for when first they begin to shrink from His word, He warns them of their duty by His messengers; and then, if this will not serve, if they obstinately reject these remedies of grace, He casts them away as desperate and destroyed for ever, swearing in His great anger, that is, determining by a peremptory decree, that they shall not enter His rest, which is the kingdom of heaven.

[p.76,77.] Is. 5. 5, 6.

§ 10. In the second part of the same Homily the author proves this same doctrine from the parable of the vine in Isaiah, as follows: "By these threatenings we are monished and warned, that if we, which are the chosen vineyard of God, bring not forth good grapes, that is to say, good works that may be delectable and pleasant in His sight, when He looketh for them, when He sendeth His messengers to call upon us for them, but rather bring forth wild grapes, that is to say, sour works, unsweet, unsavoury, and unfruitful: then will He pluck away all defence, and suffer grievous plagues of famine, and battle, dearth and death, to light upon us. Finally, if these do not yet serve, He will let us lie waste, He will give us over, He will turn away from us, He will dig and delve no more about us, He will let us alone, and suffer us to bring forth even such fruit as we will, to bring forth brambles, briars and thorns, all naughtiness, all vice, and that so abundantly, that they shall clean over-grow us, choke, strangle and utterly destroy us." He presently illustrates this tremendous dispensation of Divine Providence by the following simile. "The father as long as he loveth his child, he looketh angerly, he correcteth him when he doth amiss; but when that serveth not, and upon that he

ceaseth from correction of him, and suffereth him to do what he list himself, it is a sign that he intendeth to disinherit him, and to cast him away for ever." Shortly afterwards he thus explains the afore-mentioned parable. "Whence it is clear that God at length doth so forsake His unfruitful vineyard, that He will not only suffer it to bring forth weeds, briars and thorns; but also, further to punish the unfruitfulness of it, He saith He will not cut it, He will not delve it, and He will command the clouds that they shall not rain upon it: whereby is signified the teaching of His Holy Word which St. Paul, after a like manner, expressed by planting and watering, meaning that He will take that away from them: so that they shall be no longer of His kingdom, they shall be no longer governed by His Holy Spirit, they shall be put from the grace and benefits that they had, and even might have enjoyed through Christ; they shall be deprived of the heavenly light and life which they had in Christ, whilst they abode in Him: they shall be (as they were once) without God in this world, or rather in worse taking. And to be short, they shall be given into the power of the devil, which beareth the rule in them that be cast away from God, as he did in Saul and Judas, and generally in all such as work after their own wills, the children of mistrust, and unbelief. Let us beware therefore, good Christian people, lest that we rejecting or casting away God's Word (by the which we obtain and retain true faith in God) be not at length cast off so far that we become as the children of unbelief." Is it possible that any one, unless from mere obstinacy, could mistake the meaning of such passages? For first the author speaks of the apostacy of true believers, namely of those who once belonged to the kingdom of Christ, were governed by the Holy Spirit, and had been given such blessings which if they had kept would have made them happy for ever, and had been made partakers through Him of light and heavenly life; and then he speaks of the total apostacy of these same, how they are deprived altogether of light and heavenly life, how they become the same as they were before their conversion, even in a worse condition; how, in short, without God in the world, they are subdued into the dominion of the devil. Then their final apostacy is treated of who once were

SECT. VII.

SECT. VII.

true believers, as of those who are become like the vineyard, deserted by God, and given up to perpetual desolation, which the Lord will neither cut nor delve, nor water any more, the Holy Spirit will no longer rule, nor will they any more enjoy the light of Christ or heavenly life, whom God at last casts away, as He did Saul and Judas. Lastly, it is as clear as the noon-day sun, that the writer of the Homily does not speak of these things as an empty hypothesis, on the supposition of an impossibility or of something that never did and never will happen; but on the contrary, he is describing the ordinary dispensation which God is really wont to exercise towards those who forsake Him. For he applies the parable of the vine in Isaiah, to the subject of which he is treating, namely the apostacy of true believers, where it is plain that the prophet is teaching not what God might do on some impossible hypothesis, but what He really did to the people of Israel, and is accustomed to do to all those who imitate their ingratitude. Then these words, "They shall be put from the grace and benefits that they had, and ever might have enjoyed through Christ," &c., plainly shew that there are really some who shall in no wise enjoy for ever the life-giving blessings of Christ, which they had once received.

Moreover the author of the Homily seriously exhorts his brethren in Christ to beware lest by rejecting the word of God, which alone is able to preserve true faith, they themselves be cast away and become the sons of rebellion and perdition. But how useless, how ridiculous were all these warnings, if the salvation of all those who were once true believers, were certain and infallible! Who ever heard a Calvinist preach in that strain? Finally, Saul and Judas are given us as examples of this fearful falling away from God. As to whom it will be useless to object that they never had true justifying grace. For even if this were granted, contrary to the authority of the Homily, which is supported by some weighty reasons, it would be nothing to the purpose, since our sole object at present is to shew what was the opinion of the writer of the Homily, and not how cleverly he has proved it from Scripture. It is worth noticing, however, that in this point, as throughout the whole Homily, the author has closely followed Melancthon, who every where

teaches that Saul once was a righteous man and gifted with the Holy Spirit. Thus in his Loci Communes, on repentance, he says, "two errors of certain fanatics must be here shortly refuted, who have supposed that the regenerate cannot fall away, and although they fall against their conscience, still that they are righteous. This madness is to be condemned, and examples and sayings from the prophetic and apostolic writings must be adduced against it: as for instance, Saul and David pleased God, were righteous, and gifted with the Holy Spirit: yet they afterwards fell; the one, that he altogether perished, the other, that he afterwards returned to God." See also his treatise 'on the difference between mortal and venial sin.' Dr. Hickman must have certainly put aside all sense of shame when he dared to deny that there was any thing in this passage of the Homily which went against the indefectibility of justifying faith. SECT. VII. vol. i. p. 428. ed. Basil, 1561.

§ 11. But that all may see how consistently our Church has held this doctrine, I will quote another remarkable passage from the second book of Homilies, which were set forth in the reign of Queen Elizabeth, and confirmed by her authority in a lawful convocation of our clergy. In the Homily on the Resurrection, after having explained at length the benefits we enjoy from the resurrection of Christ, the writer thus addresses the people: "These things, I say, well considered, let us now, in the rest of our life, declare our faith that we have in this most fruitful article, by framing ourselves thereunto, in rising daily from sin, to righteousness and holiness of life. 'For what shall it avail us,' saith St. Peter, 'to be escaped and delivered from the filthiness of the world, through the knowledge of the Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, if we be entangled again therewith, and be overcome again. Certainly it had been better,' saith he, 'never to have known the way of righteousness, than, after it is known and received, to turn back again from the holy commandment of God given unto us.' For so shall the proverb have place in us where it is said, 'The dog is returned to his vomit again, and the sow that was washed, to her wallowing in the mire, again.' What a shame were it for us, being thus so clearly and freely washed from our sin, to return to the filthiness thereof again! What a folly were 2 Pet. 2. 20—22. Prov. 26. 11.

SECT. VII.

it, thus endowed with righteousness, to lose it again! What madness were it to lose the inheritance we be now set in, for the vile and transitory pleasure of sin! And what an unkindness should it be, where our Saviour Christ of His mercy is come to us, to dwell within us as our guest, to drive Him from us, and to banish Him violently out of our souls, and instead of Him, in Whom is all grace and virtue, to receive the ungracious spirit of the devil, the founder of all naughtiness and mischief! How can we find in our hearts to shew such extreme unkindness to Christ, which hath now so gently called us to mercy, and offered Himself unto us, and He now entered within us? Yea, how dare we be so bold to renounce the presence of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost; (for where one is, there is God, whole in majesty, together with all His power, wisdom, and goodness;) and fear not, I say, the danger and peril of so traiterous defiance and departure? Good Christian brethren and sisters, advise yourselves, consider the dignity that ye be now set in; let not folly lose the thing that grace hath so preciously offered and purchased, let not wilfulness and blindness put out so great light that is now shewed unto you." What can be more clear than that the writer is here speaking of the total and final apostacy of true believers? And that he conceived this apostacy might take place, and not unfrequently did so, is plain from his beseeching Christian believers with extreme earnestness to take every care that they never fall into so miserable and utterly deplorable a condition. Why is it that he interprets the passage from St. Peter, as the ancients did, of the apostacy of true believers? and there the apostacy is plainly described as not only possible, but as having really taken place in some—in whom the truth of the old proverb had been proved; 'The dog to his vomit,' &c.

§ 12. I might produce many other passages from the Homilies bearing upon this point, but I fear being wearisome to my reader. I may refer him, however, to the end of the Homily on the Nativity. It would be very easy also to prove this doctrine by the consent of our divines who lived in the first ages of the Reformation, when the Articles and Homilies were set forth, and who held the highest office in

Hom. ii. [p. 365.]

our Church. But of our private Doctors, (as Dr. Tully says,) let us take two names only, (but what names are they !) Hooper and Latimer. Hooper, Bishop of Gloucester and Martyr, in the preface to his Exposition of the Decalogue, says, "The cause of reprobation or damnation is sin in man who will not hear and receive the Gospel, or who, after he has received it, falls into a contempt of it by the habit of sinning," &c. Where the holy prelate clearly teaches that there are some, who, after having received the Gospel, fall into the habit of sin, and are at length eternally condemned and rejected by God. And that Hooper is speaking of a true reception of the Gospel, and not feigned as that of hypocrites, (as Dr. Hickman would perversely interpret his words,) is clearly proved in this way. The same reception of the Gospel is meant in the latter clause of the sentence, as is meant in the former, in these words: "The cause of damnation is sin in man who will not hear and receive the Gospel." And there Hooper is evidently speaking of the reception of the Gospel by true faith. For men are not damned because they do not receive the Gospel as hypocrites, but because they do not receive it truly and heartily. Besides, these words of Hooper, together with those that follow them, (as shall be clearly shewn in the proper place,) are entirely taken from the writings of Melancthon, and so ought to be explained according to his meaning. Now Melancthon, in his Loci Theologici, on Predestination, says, "It is certain that this is the cause of reprobation, namely, sin in men who will not hear or receive the Gospel at all, or who renounce their faith before they depart hence." What kind of faith Melancthon means, is clear from what he says immediately afterwards. "We judge that they are without doubt chosen, who apprehend by faith the mercy promised for Christ's sake, and who do not reject that confidence in the end." It is quite clear then (whatever Dr. Hickman may chatter against it) that Hooper agreed with Melancthon in holding that there are some, who, in the end, reject that faith by which the mercy promised for Christ's sake is apprehended, that is, justifying faith, and on that account are condemned and rejected eternally by God. In the seventeenth chapter of the same work, Hooper says, "Let us not,

SECT. VII.

Hist. Armin. p. 479, 480.

[vol. i. p. 257.]

SECT. VII.

therefore, reject the grace offered to us, nor drive it away when received, through an evil life. If we fall, let us listen to the word of Almighty God, Who calls us to repentance; let us turn to Him, and continue no longer in sin, and let us not add sin to sin, lest at length we fall into contempt of God, and of His Holy Word."

§ 13. Latimer, Bishop of London, and a steadfast Martyr, in a sermon on the third Sunday after Epiphany, teaches that "it is possible for us who have been once written in the book of life, afterwards through forgetfulness of God, and of His Word, and an evil life, to be blotted out from the same." And on Romans 3. 11. he says, "Those who have not yet come to Christ, or, who, after having come, have departed from Him, (as there are not a few, who, having fallen into sin against their conscience, in the end lose the grace of God, salvation, and the Holy Spirit,) all these, I say, who are not in favour with God, do not grieve for their sins, but keep the purpose of sinning yet more." What can be more plain than this?

Part iii. p. 198.

p. 114.

§ 14. It almost ashames and grieves one to relate what is said by some against this plain teaching. The author of the work called 'Ibis ad Cæsarem,' brings the following passage from the Homilies against the learned Montague: "Though the godly do fall, yet they walk not on purposely in sin, they stand not still to continue and tarry in sin, they sit not down like careless men, without all fear of God's just punishment for sin, but defying sin through God's great grace, and infinite mercy, they rise again and fight against sin." Surely people who see such miserable loopholes as these, shew they are driven to great straits. For this is nothing to the purpose; the writer of the Homily is evidently speaking here not of those heavier sins, called mortal, by which the godly depart from their holiness and so from the grace of God, but of those lighter offences of godly persons, which are called sins of daily commission, and which do not drive away the Holy Spirit, nor lay waste the conscience. He thus argues from the first Psalm: "The Prophet David describing a happy man, saith, 'Blessed is the man that doth not walk after the counsel of the ungodly, nor stand in the way of sinners, nor sit in the seat of the scornful.' There are three

Homily on certain places of Scripture; part ii. [p. 335.]

Ps. 1. 1.

sorts of people whose company the Prophet would have him flee and avoid, which shall be an happy man, and partaker of God's blessing. First, 'he may not walk after the counsel of the ungodly.' Secondly, 'he may not stand in the way of sinners.' Thirdly, 'he must not sit in the seat of the scornful.' By these three sorts of people, ungodly men, sinners, and scornful, all impiety is signified and fully expressed. By the ungodly, he understandeth those which have no regard of Almighty God, being void of all faith, whose hearts and minds are so set upon the world, that they study only how to accomplish their worldly practices, their carnal imaginations, their filthy lust and desire, without any fear of God. The second sort he calleth sinners, not such as do fall through ignorance or frailness, for then who should be found free? What man ever lived upon earth, Christ only excepted, but he hath sinned? 'The just man falleth seven times, and riseth again.' Though the godly do fall, yet they walk not on purposely in sin," &c. What sense of shame can these men have, who do not blush to bring forward such passages as these to support their cause? and yet of the same kind are all the passages in our Homilies, which are made to support the indefectibility of justifying faith.

Prov. 24. 16.

§ 15. Dr. Hickman also brings forward a passage in the public Catechism set forth in the reign of Edward VI., where in treating of the Catholic Church, it says, "Into this His state, as it were, God hath enrolled an infinite multitude of men, who submit to Christ as their only King, listen to and are obedient to His word, who have committed themselves to His care, and whose patron He Himself has undertaken to be, whom He for ever defends and keeps. To this commonwealth there properly belong all who truly fear, honour, and call upon God, who give themselves up to a godly and holy life, and putting all their confidence and hope in God, most surely wait for the blessedness of eternal life. And they who are firm, steadfast, and constant in this faith, are elect and chosen, and, as we say, predestinated to this so great blessedness before the foundation of the world."

p. 86. Lat. ed. Lond. 1570.

Upon these words of the Catechism Dr. Hickman thus triumphs. "Here is Calvinism! As many as fear God have been elected, chosen, and predestinated to eternal life before

Hist. Armin. p. 460.

SECT. VII.

the foundation of the world: therefore if a man fall from life eternal he never feared God." But here, as almost every where else, we miss good faith or judgment in our historian. For where, I ask, is it said in these words of the Catechism, As many as fear God have been predestinated to eternal life before the foundation of the world? Rather the reverse of this is sufficiently clearly taught, namely, that there are some who truly fear God, &c., and yet are not predestinated to eternal life. The Catechism first teaches that as many as are true believers properly belong to the commonwealth or Church of Christ, as long as they are such. Then it takes out from this collection of true believers those who are firm, steadfast, and constant in the faith; and affirms only of these that they have been chosen to eternal life before the foundations of the world; which who that is a Catholic will deny? What would be the use of this distinction, if all who have once been true believers were necessarily firm, steadfast, and constant in the faith, and so elected? and so we see Dr. Hickman has but wounded himself with his own weapon. And thus far of the judgment of the Church of England.

§ 16. Let us now proceed to foreign Churches. It is quite clear that the most ancient and greatest of the reformed Confessions agree with our own Church on this article. The Confession of Augsburg, which, when it was set forth, was considered to be the common doctrine of all Protestants, and to which nearly all the reformed Churches gave testimony, and their most celebrated divines subscribed, and amongst them Calvin himself, in its sixth article thus speaks; "Thus this obedience ought to resist evil desires, and be made purer from time to time by spiritual exercises, and we must beware lest we commit any sin against our conscience, according to that which is written, 'Love out of a pure heart, a good conscience, and a faith unfeigned in the fulfilling of the law.' But they who obey evil desires, and act against their conscience, and live in deadly sins, and retain not the righteousness of faith and the righteousness of good works, according to St. Paul, they who do such things shall not inherit the kingdom of God."

In the eleventh article it says, "They condemn the Anabaptists also, who say that those once justified cannot lose

again the Holy Spirit." Dr. Hickman, indeed, denies that these passages ought to be understood of the total and final apostacy of true believers. But that unblushing writer may be easily refuted from the writings of Melancthon, who wrote the Confession, in which he affirms again and again most clearly, the possibility and not unfrequent occurrence of true believers and righteous men losing in the end their faith and righteousness. The reader may refer to his Loci Communes, on Repentance and the Difference between Mortal and Venial Sin. But that the subject may be put beyond the reach of controversy let us turn to the Saxon Confession. SECT. VII.

§ 17. This Confession was written by Melancthon (as he himself affirms in the preface to his Body of Divinity) at the Synod of Wittemberg in the year 1551, where the clergymen and doctors of the Churches and Universities of Saxony and Meissen had assembled, all of whom subscribed to it as to a repetition and explanation of the Augsburg Confession, to be proposed at the Council of Trent, in the name of all Protestants[1]. It was approved of by the heads of the houses of Brandenburg and Mansfeld, by the clergy of Strasburg, and by the pastors and doctors of the Pomeranian Churches, in written documents annexed at the end of the Confession. It met with the approval also of other Churches, and was commended by those of Poland in their consent or reconciliation. Now in the ninth article of this Confession, on Rewards, we read as follows: "'Whoever are led by the Spirit of God, are the sons of God, and if sons, then heirs of God,' &c.; and yet it is at the same time true, that those who cast away the Holy Spirit, either by falling away from the faith, or acting against their conscience, and who do not return to God by repentance, are not heirs; as it is written in the Epistle to the Galatians, 'they who do such things shall not possess the kingdom of God.'" The same thing is expressed more clearly in the following article on the Difference of Sins, in these words: "When it is said that sins remain in the regenerate, it is necessary to make a difference. For, from what is written in St. Luke 11. 26, 'Then

[1] "The Saxon Confession was certainly written in the name of all the Churches, to be offered to the Council of Trent." Admon. de lib. Concord. p. 189.

SECT. VII.

goeth he and taketh to him seven other spirits more wicked than himself, and they enter in and dwell there,' and from other passages, it is evident that some regenerate persons do grieve and drive out the Holy Spirit, and are rejected by God and become subject to His wrath and everlasting punishment; and in Ezekiel 33. 18, 'when the righteous turneth from his righteousness, and committeth iniquity, he shall die thereby.' It is necessary therefore that the difference be maintained between sins which remain in holy men during this mortal life, and which do not drive out the Holy Spirit, and those, on account of which a man becomes again subject to the wrath of God, and everlasting punishment," &c. The whole article is well worth reading. Now surely he must be most barefaced who shall deny that the doctrine we are contending for is taught in these passages, for it is plain they speak not only of the possibility, but of the act or event, and affirm that there are really some regenerate persons who grieve and drive out the Holy Spirit, and are again rejected by God, and become subject to His wrath and everlasting punishment. And that no one should doubt whether this is meant of the final apostacy of the regenerate, the authors of the Confession prove their opinion by two remarkable passages of Holy Writ, namely, St. Luke 11. 26, and Ezekiel 33. 18: the former expressly speaks of those 'whose last condition is worse than the first,' the latter no less plainly 'of the righteous man turning from his righteousness and dying in his iniquity.' See also the fifteenth article, towards the end.

§ 18. The Bohemian or Waldensian Confession plainly upholds the same doctrine. This Confession was made from very much more ancient Confessions, and was approved of by Luther, Melancthon, and the University of Wittemberg, and was at length submitted to King Ferdinand, by the barons and nobility of Bohemia in the year 1535. Now in the fifth article there is the following statement: "They also teach the absolved, that is, those who have had their sins remitted by Christ, to be grateful for the grace of God received in Christ, lest they receive that grace in vain, and fall again into sin, as it is written, 'Go and sin no more, lest a worse thing come unto thee:' and again, 'If we sin wilfully after

[Joh. 5. 14.]

[Heb. 10. 26.]

that we have received the knowledge of the truth, there remaineth no more sacrifice for sins,'" &c. In the twentieth and last article, which is inscribed, "Of the time of grace, in which the favour of God should be sought and may be found," the extreme madness is reprehended of those in general, who defer repentance to the last stage of their life, and especially those who after having received the grace of justification, fall into the greater sins and delay to return and be turned to the Lord. The words are as follows: "But chief of all, whoso having received the proof of Divine favour towards him, shall of his own accord, and willingly indulge in sins, and despise and neglect so many salutary warnings calling him to repentance; whoso wantonly and foolishly abusing the mercy of God, and staying himself on it, shall become hardened in his sins even to the very approach of death, and then roused for the first time by the fear and horror of instant and everlasting death, begins perchance too late, to grow wise, such an one is in danger, lest to his extreme cost he meet with the wrath, and not the mercy of God, as His own words testify. Thus saith the Lord by Micah: 'Then shall they cry unto the Lord, but He will not hear them: He will even hide His face from them at that time, as they have behaved themselves ill in their doings: for they would not hear My voice when I stretched forth My hands unto them all the day long.' Truly it is to be feared, lest he reap the due rewards of his deeds, for having so slothfully and wastefully abused the time which God had granted unto him for repentance. Nevertheless, let no one despair. For even if in the last moment of death he shall shew signs of true repentance, which, however, rarely happens to such men, (for with truth doth St. Paul say 'and this we will do if God permit,') he must not be refused the comfort of absolution." By which we are plainly taught, 1. that there are persons who, after having received the proof of the Divine favour towards them, (that is, as is said above, after they have been absolved and have received remission of sins through Christ,) willingly plunge into sin and neglect the salutary warning calling them to repent in time, and continue hardened in sin even to the very approach of death. And 2ndly, that the repentance and salvation of

ch. 3. 4.

SECT. VII. such is so far from being certain and infallible, that it is very doubtful and full of danger: for it is of the lapsed that the Waldensians understand these tremendous words of the Lord by His prophet: "They shall call unto Me, and I will not hear," &c. And they moreover expressly say, that it very rarely happens that such persons give signs of true repentance, applying to such what the author of the Epistle to
ch. 6. 3. the Hebrews says concerning those who have apostatized from the faith of Christ.

§ 19. But it is now time for us reverently to listen to the voice of the ancient Church upon this subject, and to enquire what the age of old held concerning it, as Dr. Tully himself
Justif. Paul. p. 12. advises. I have said that his supposition that the salvation of all those who have been once endued with justifying faith is certain, was opposed to the judgment of all Catholic antiquity. If Dr. Tully will not believe me whom he considers a mere novice in the writings of the Fathers, he will at least trust two witnesses who without doubt are most conversant in the works of antiquity, and moreover are most
lib. vi. upright men. The great Gerard Vossius, in his History of Pelagianism, in explaining his eleventh thesis, proves by most clear testimony that St. Augustine himself constantly acknowledges that justifying faith and regenerating grace might be lost and is lost by many, notwithstanding his own addition to the common opinion of the early Fathers on Perseverance, namely, that that was not only the gift of God, but that it flowed necessarily from the absolute decree of salvation. In his twelfth thesis he boldly affirms that "all antiquity is opposed to indefectibility;" and in confirmation and explanation of this thesis, he, at other times a most unassuming writer, compelled by the audacity of some who blushed not to join the authority of the ancients to their
[vol. vi. p. 749.] novel and contrary opinion, thus expresses himself; "That what we have said is the common opinion of antiquity, such moderns alone can deny, who in other matters perhaps are not uneducated, but yet are plainly strangers to antiquity, or who have their minds so enslaved to one or two men's opinions, as to choose rather seeing with their eyes than with their own, and prefer erring with them to thinking rightly with others."

SECT. VII.

This great man clearly shews also how clumsily many passages of the Fathers are brought forward by some who have misused them for supporting this doctrine of indefectibility, and proposes certain clear rules and distinctions by which apparent contradictions in ancient writers on this subject may be easily removed. Our next witness is the right reverend and very learned prelate, and noble ornament of our Church, John Overall, who in his judgment on the five points, thus speaks concerning this question. "That opinion which is the cause of so much dispute, namely, 'of the certain perseverance of all those who have once believed, and have been regenerate,' was never approved of by any of the Fathers of the ancient Church, but has been rejected by all antiquity, and but too well refuted by the experience of all ages [m], and never arose till these later times," &c. After these witnesses, who are universally considered worthy of credit, the great Grotius, perhaps, may obtain a fair hearing even from his enemies. It is worth while attending to what he says in the Animadversions on his notes to Cassander, (title On the Difference of Sins.) "A more pernicious doctrine," he says, "could not have been introduced into Christianity than this,—namely, that a man who has believed or been regenerate, (for these terms with many are equivalent,) might fall into wickedness and crimes, but that it was impossible for him, on that account, to fall from the favour of God, or incur his condemnation. None of the ancients taught this, none would have endured it to be taught, nor have I ever seen plainer proofs of Scripture being wrested to private and bad interpretations than in this matter." Nor has Riveta, the celebrated opponent of Grotius, either in his Examination or elsewhere, adduced any proof from any ancient Catholic writer, of the certain and infallible perseverance of all the regenerate, which, when examined on the rules and observations of Vossius which I have just mentioned, is not clearly altogether foreign to his purpose. Let the reader compare them and judge for himself.

[Lambeth Articles. Lond. 1651.]

[Op. vol. iii. p. 649.]

[m] "It is proved alas by many examples, that some of those who have been regenerated in Christ Jesus, renouncing their faith and holy conduct apostatize from God, and end their wicked life in aversion from Him." Prosper. Respons. ad cap. Gallor. Resp. ad Object. 7. [Append. ad vol. x. Augustini Op. p. 199.]

SECT. VII.

§ 20. With some meaning, however, did Overall say that this opinion of the indefectibility of justifying faith "had been rejected by all antiquity:" and Grotius, that "none of the ancients would have endured the teacher of it." For there were formerly some who dared to put forth this dogma, but they were continually rejected by the Catholic Fathers of the Church, and were considered unorthodox, if not heretical. The first promoters of this opinion (as far as I can remember) were the Valentinians, of whom Irenæus gives the following account. "For as that which is earthly cannot partake of salvation, (for they say it is not capable of it,) so, on the contrary, that which is spiritual, which they say themselves are, cannot admit corruption in whatever actions they may be involved. For in the same way as gold thrown into the mire loseth not its beauty, but retaineth its own nature, the mire having no power to hurt the gold, so they say that themselves, though engaged in any kind of material actions, cannot be injured or lose any of their spiritual substance." And again, "They exalt and call themselves perfect, and the seeds of election. We, they say, have received grace only as a loan, and therefore it will be taken from us, but that themselves profess it as their own, having come down to them from heaven from the ineffable and mysterious syzygy, and therefore, that it will increase in them." Nothing certainly can be more similar to this doctrine of the Valentinians (if you only take away the "syzygy"), than the opinion of certain divines, whose names I forbear mentioning. What was the opinion of Irenæus, and Catholics of that age, and how opposed it was to the madness of the Gnostics, is clear from a passage in his fourth book, chapter the seventy-second. "Since," he says, "all are of the same nature, and are able to retain and exercise what is good, and to lose it and not do good: with men, (and how much more with God,) some are justly praised and receive the just testimony of good choice and perseverance: while others are accused, and receive the punishment they deserved, because they have rejected what is just and good."

lib. i. ch. 1. p. 26. edit. Feuard. [I. 6. 2. p. 29.]

p. 28. [p. 31.]

συζυγία

[iv. 37. 2. p. 281.]

Advers. Jovinian. lib. ii. [§ 1. vol. ii. p. 321.]

§ 21. St. Jerome places this as second among the erroneous dogmas of Jovinian, viz., that "those who had been baptized cannot be tempted by the devil; (so as to fall under

the temptation;) and that if any were tempted, it was a proof that they had been baptized with water only, and not with the Spirit." Jovinian, therefore, supposed that no one truly regenerate was ever conquered and overcome by the devil, so as to be able to be brought again into his dominion. In refuting his error, St. Jerome, besides others, brings forward the passage from the Hebrews, and thus argues from it: "We cannot deny that those have been baptized (i. e. with the Spirit), who have been enlightened and have tasted of the heavenly gift and were made partakers of the Holy Ghost. But if the baptized cannot sin, how does the Apostle say, 'If they shall fall away?'" Towards the end of the fourth century the Predestinarian heresy arose, the leader of which was one Lucidus, a Priest: to whom Faustus, while he still clearly professed to be a Catholic, wrote an epistle which the Synod of Arles approved of. In it are certain anathemas, the third of which is as follows. "Cursed be he that sayeth that he who has perished received not grace, so as that he could be saved." Whence it is quite clear that Lucidus, who falls under this anathema, said that none of those who perish had ever received any thing from Christ by which he might be saved; that he had not even been gifted with justifying grace, or ever been made truly regenerate in Christ. And this is still clearer from the explanation of the Catholic opinion, as opposed to this error of the Predestinarians which occurs in the same epistle, in these words: "But we, by the illumination of Christ, truly and confidently affirm, that he who has perished through sin, could have been saved through grace if he had not denied active obedience to grace ever waiting on him; and that he who through grace attains by humble obedience to the goal of a happy consummation, might have fallen through sloth, and perished through sin." Shortly afterwards, as it appears from Faustus's preface, the Synod of Lyons subscribed to the anathemas of that of Arles.

SECT. VII.

ch. 6. 4—6.

[Vid. Monumenta Patrum Orthodox. Basil. 1569. part ii. p. 72.]

§ 22. At length in the ninth century the wretched monk Gothescalcus revived the condemned heresy of the Predestinarians. Hincmar, in a letter to Pope Nicolas, has given us his dogmas, amongst which is the following: "Those who perish were never truly, but only sacramentally redeemed."

Apud Flodoardum, iii. 14.

SECT. VII.

This is explained more clearly in a letter from Amolo, Archbishop of Lyons, to Gothescalcus, which has now at length been published by the learned I. Sirmondi. In this letter, Amolo relates that he had seen the writings of Gothescalcus, on Divine Predestination: and he selects from them six heads of doctrine to be severally refuted, the third of which is, "They who perish out of the number of the faithful were never incorporated into Christ or His Church, or made members of the lost and saved sheep, and so were never Christians, even at the time when either in their infancy they were brought to partake in the mysteries of regeneration and the Holy Sacrifice, or in maturer years they themselves approached thereunto." Gothescalcus, with his new dogmas, was condemned by all the Bishops of Germany in 848, at the Synod of Mayence, at which Rabanus Maurus, the great ornament of that age, presided, and the famous Haymo was present. The Church of Rheims over which Hincmar presided, and a Council of other Bishops of Belgian Gaul, commonly called the Council of Cresci, shortly afterwards agreed to the decrees of this Synod. So manifest was the agreement upon this article of Catholic tradition, and so great was the reverence for it at that time amongst parties who differed in other points, that even the Church of Lyons, in most things but too well inclined towards Gothescalcus, did not dare to defend the teacher of novelties in this particular, but approved of the decision of both Synods. The Synod also of Valence, which was held by fourteen Bishops from the provinces of Lyons, Vienne and Arles, condemned in the same terms as the above-mentioned Synods, this doctrine of Gothescalcus, on the certain salvation of all regenerate persons: although, from some unworthy jealousy, as a learned man has remarked, all kinds of attempts were made to shake and annul the decrees of the Council of Cresci, and even of Mayence, the leader of which attempts was one Ebbo of Grenoble, who was secretly an enemy of Hincmar, the chief promoter of the act of Cresci, because, when his uncle Ebbo, Bishop of Rheims, was degraded, Hincmar was appointed his successor. Now in the fifth canon of this Council it is thus decreed: "We believe also that it must be most firmly held, that the whole multitude of the faithful regenerated by

[Vide Sirmondi Op. Paris. 1696. vol. ii. p. 1139.]

Vide Flodoard. ubi supra.

tom. iii. Concil. Gal. p. 66.

Vide tom. ii. Auctarii Bib. Patr. col. 1204.

[Anno 855. Concil. Gal. tom. iii. p. 98.]

water and the Holy Ghost, and by this truly incorporated into the Church, and according to the apostolic doctrine, baptized into the death of Christ, are washed in His blood from their sins: for true regeneration could not take place in them unless there were true redemption also, since in the sacraments of the Church nothing is vain, nothing delusive, but every thing is wholly true, and depending on His truth and steadfastness. Yet of this body of the faithful and redeemed, some are everlastingly saved because by the grace of God they continue faithfully in their state of redemption, keeping in mind the word of their Lord Himself: 'He that endureth to the end the same shall be saved:' and some because they will not continue in the salvation of faith which they received at the beginning, but chose to make the grace of redemption of none effect by their evil doctrine rather than preserve it, by no means attain unto the fulness of salvation and participation of eternal blessedness." Thus we see the opinion of Gothescalcus on this head was rejected with an extraordinary degree of consent on both sides. And the Church of Christ continued unanimous on this point till the sixteenth century, when every one knows by whom the error of Gothescalcus was again upheld. And indeed, I hardly think that any other point of Christian doctrine could be found, which has come down to us with a greater consent of Catholic doctors, or with a more unbroken tradition than this on the defectibility of justifying faith. SECT. VII.

§ 23. But finally to clench the point. Even supposing we were to grant that the Church of England is entirely silent on this point, and has given no express or definite opinion for either side, (which we have shewn above to be utterly false,) still all true sons of our Church would be bound totally to reject and condemn their opinion who uphold the certain and infallible salvation of all who have been once regenerate. They would be bound to do this, I say, by the canon which was decreed in the Synod held in London 1571, which we have mentioned in this Apology and elsewhere. In this canon it is expressly commanded, "that they preach nothing to be religiously held and believed by the people, except that which is agreeable to the doctrine of the Old and New Testament, and which the Catholic Fathers and ancient Bishops have collected from

SECT. VII. that very doctrine." How then can they evade this canon, who not only preach the doctrine of indefectibility to be religiously held by all, (which doctrine the Catholic Fathers and ancient Bishops are so far from collecting from the Scriptures, that with one voice they have openly rejected and condemned it as plainly contrary to Scripture, and withal extremely dangerous,) but in order that the poison may more widely spread amongst the people, carefully inculcate it in their systems, Enchiridions and Catechisms for candidates for the ministry, to be taught by them to others? Who is not indignant at the iniquity of those men who whilst they themselves fiercely uphold the novelties of some innovator of yesterday, both in this and other points of doctrine, in opposition to the whole stream of ancient doctors, are before the unlearned furiously attacking their opponents, who shrink most religiously from departing even a hair's breadth from the judgment of antiquity, and brand them with the names of innovators and deserters of the doctrine of the Church? But let us proceed to other matters.

§ 24. Fourthly, and lastly, Dr. Tully teaches that "Christ has made satisfaction and offered Himself upon the cross
ch. 7. solely for the sins of the elect." For in his Enchiridion, when treating on the Satisfaction of Christ, he thus interrogates the catechumen. "*A.* Has Christ then truly made satisfaction for the sins of the faithful." *B.* "Yes, entirely." But why this restriction 'for the sins of the faithful?' Why
[c.2.p.16.] not 'for the sins of all mankind?' For as Overall excellently explains this, "Scripture simply tells us that God gave His Son for the world, and it places the condition not in the death of Christ, but in the faith of man, and in his salvation to follow conditionally from faith. The Son is so given, that if men believe in Him, they may be saved. But whether they believe or not, God has given His Son for them, and in Him hath proposed salvation under the condition of faith. But that men may perform this condition, God both exhorts them in His word, and in deed excites and helps them by the grace of the Holy Spirit, so that the fault is with men and not with God if they do not believe." But who, according to the Doctor, are these faithful persons, for whom alone Christ has truly made satisfaction? only the elect, who, as

has just been shewn the Doctor expressly lays down, possess justifying faith. But how greatly does this restriction and limitation of the satisfaction of Jesus Christ for the elect alone, strike at the very foundations of the Gospel: and how entirely this opinion was rejected and anathematized by the ancient Catholic Church, may be clearly seen from what has been already said in the answer to the eleventh Stricture. § 8. p. 78. That the more ancient Confessions of the foreign reformed Churches, as that of Augsburg, Saxony, &c., openly and constantly support and defend the universality of grace and redemption through Christ, must be seen at once, by any one who has even looked at these Confessions. It remains then for us to see what is the opinion of the English Church. That Christ has not only truly redeemed the elect but even those who perish, follows most clearly from the position which we have just explained: namely, that some of those who perish, were gifted through and for the sake of Christ with true regenerating and justifying grace, and were actually placed in a state of salvation: from whence they fell through their own fault. But we need not here have recourse to inferences. SECT. VII.

§ 25. Let us again listen to the learned Bishop Overall: "Concerning the death of Christ," he says, "so plain and consistent is the opinion of our Church, that our Lord Jesus Christ died for all men whatsoever, or for all the sins of all men, that it is wonderful how any amongst us have dared to controvert this point. In the seventh article, 'Both in the Old and New Testament, everlasting life is offered to mankind by Christ, Who is the only Mediator between God and man, being both God and man.' In the fifteenth, 'Christ came to be the Lamb without spot, Who by sacrifice of Himself once made, should take away the sins of the world.' In the thirty-first, 'The offering of Christ once made, is that perfect redemption, propitiation, and satisfaction for all the sins of the whole world, both original and actual.' The same is taught in the common Catechism as the plainest meaning of the second article of the Creed, in which every one is to believe in God the Son, 'Who redeemed Him and all mankind.' So in the Nicene Creed, 'Who for us men, and for our salvation, came down from heaven,' &c. And in [c.2.p.45.]

SECT. VII.

many places in our Liturgy, as in the consecration of the Eucharist, 'God, Who didst give Thine only Son Jesus Christ to suffer death upon the cross for our redemption, Who made there by His one oblation, &c. a full, perfect, and sufficient sacrifice, oblation, and satisfaction for the sins of the whole world.' And the Communion is given to each, in these words: 'The Body of our Lord Jesus Christ, which was given for thee. The Blood which was shed for thee,'" &c.

§ 26. Many passages in the Homilies agree with the Articles in this point. But not to be tedious, it will suffice to quote one or two from the Homily of the Death and Passion of our Saviour Christ, where, if any where, it is fair to suppose that our Church has declared her opinion in the matter. In the beginning of the second part the great mercy of our Saviour Christ is set forth, "Who suffered death universally for all men." And afterwards in the same Homily we read, "'So God loved the world,' saith St. John, 'that He gave His only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in Him, should not perish, but have life everlasting.' If God declared so great love towards us, His silly creatures, how can we of right but love Him again? was not this a sure pledge of His love, to give us His own Son from heaven? He might have given us an angel if He would, or some other creature, and yet should His love have been far above our deserts. Now He gave us not an angel, but His Son. And what Son? His only Son, His natural Son, His well-beloved Son. Even that Son whom He had made lord and ruler over all things. Was not this a singular token of great love? But to whom did He give Him? He gave Him to the whole world: that is to say, Adam, and all that should come after him." What could be more clearly stated?

Hom. ii. [p. 375.]

[ib. 380.]

§ 27. Let me see, however, what our most approved divines have determined on this point, and those too who lived at the time when the Articles and Homilies were put forth. We again appeal to the two Martyrs, Hooper and Latimer, as witnesses to this doctrine of the Church. Hooper, in his Explanation of the Decalogue, (of which valuable work it is much to be regretted that through our own carelessness scarcely any copies remain,) so frequently, so openly, and so

vigorously defends the doctrine of the universality of redemption and Divine grace through Christ, and moreover, so meets the principal objections brought against it, that clearer and more accurate statements are scarcely to be found amongst the learned divines of our own age, who lived after the controversy had been sifted. But let us hear his own words: in the preface to this Exposition, he says; "All those, that be comprehended under the promise, belong to Christ. And as far extendeth the virtue and strength of God's promise to save man, as the rigour and justice of that law for sin to damn man. 'Therefore as by the offence of one judgment came upon all men unto condemnation,' as St. Paul saith, 'even so by the righteousness of one the free gift came upon all men unto justification of life.' The words of the promise made unto Adam and Abraham confirm the same: they are these: 'I will put enmity between thee and the woman, and between thy seed and her seed; it shall bruise thy head, and thou shalt bruise his heel.' For as we were in Adam before his fall, and should, if he had not sinned, have been of the same innocence and perfection that he was created in; so were we in his loins when he sinned, and participated of his sin. And as we were in him, and partakers of the ill; so were we in him, when God made him a promise of grace; and we are partakers of the same grace, not as the children of Adam, but as the children of promise. As the sins of Adam without privilege or exception extended and appertained unto all Adam's and every of Adam's posterity; so did this promise of grace generally appertain as well to every and singular of Adam's posterity, as to Adam: as it is more plainly expressed where God promiseth to bless in the seed of Abraham all the people of the world; and Paul maketh no diversity in Christ of Jew or Gentile. Further; it was never forbid, but that all sorts of people and of every progeny in the world should be made partakers of the Jews' religion and ceremonies. Further; St. Paul doth by collation of Adam and Christ, sin and grace, thus interpret God's promise, and maketh not Christ inferior to Adam, nor grace unto sin. If all then shall be saved, what is to be said of those that St. Peter speaketh of, that shall perish for their false doctrine. And likewise Christ saith, that the gate is

SECT. VII.

Rom. 5. 17, 18.

Gen. 3. 15.

Gen. 15. 4, 5; 17. 1.

Gal. 3. 28. Col. 3. 11.

Rom. 5. 15.

1 Pet. 2.

SECT. VII.

straight that leadeth to life, and few enter? Thus the Scripture answereth, that the promise of grace appertaineth to every sort of men in the world, and comprehendeth them all; howbeit within certain limits and bounds, the which if men neglect or pass over, they exclude themselves from the promise in Christ. As Cain was no more excluded till he excluded himself, than Abel, Saul than David, Judas than Peter, Esau than Jacob. By the Scripture it seemeth that the sentence of God was given to save the one, and to damn the other, before the one loved God, or the other hated God. Howbeit these threatenings of God against Esau, if he had not of his wilful malice excluded himself from the promise of grace, should no more have hindered his salvation than God's threatenings against Nineveh; which notwithstanding that God said it should be destroyed within forty days, stood a great time after, and did penance. Esau was circumcised and presented unto the Church of God by his father Isaac in all external ceremonies, as well as Jacob, and that his life and conversation were not as agreeable unto justice and equity as Jacob's, the sentence of God unto Rebecca was not in the fault, but his own malice. For there is mentioned nothing at all in that place that Esau was disinherited of eternal life, but that he should be inferior to his brother Jacob in this world: which prophecy was fulfilled in their posterity, and not in the persons themselves. Of this acceptation of the one, and reprobation of the other, concerning the promise of the earth, speaketh Malachi the Prophet, as the beginning of his book declareth, speaking in this wise: 'I have loved you, saith the Lord: yet ye say, Wherein hast Thou loved us?' God answereth, 'Was not Esau Jacob's brother? saith the Lord: notwithstanding I loved Jacob and hated Esau.' Wherein hated God Esau? the Prophet sheweth: 'I laid his mountains and his heritage waste for dragons of the wilderness.' Wherein he loved Jacob the text declareth. God transferred the right and title that appertained unto Esau the elder brother, to Jacob the younger: likewise the land that was promised unto Abraham and Isaac, was by legacy and testament given unto Jacob and his posterity. St. Paul useth this example of Jacob and Esau for none other purpose but to take away from the Jews the thing that

Jon. 1.

Gen. 25. 23.

Mal. 1.2,3.

Gen. 25. 23.

they most put their trust in; that is to say, the vain hope they had in the carnal lineage and natural descent from the family and household of Abraham; and likewise their false confidence they had in the keeping of the law of Moses." Thus far Hooper. Which of the divines whom Dr. Tully insults as innovators, could wish for any thing more explicit in this controversy than this? And it is especially to be observed, that the blessed Martyr fully and entirely agrees with us in his explanation of that celebrated passage of St. Paul, (Rom. 9,) from the misconstruction of which passage the Calvinists have deduced their dreadful doctrines which we are now opposing.

§ 28. Presently in the same preface, after a long discussion on original sin, (where he expressly denies that the image of God was destroyed in man by it,) he goes on in the following words. "And this imperfection or natural sickness taken of Adam, excludeth not the person from the promise of God in Christ, except we transgress the limits and bounds of this original sin by our own folly and malice, and either of a contempt or hate of God's word, we fall into sin, and transform ourselves into the image of the devil. Then we exclude by this means ourselves from the promises and merits of Christ, Who only receives our infirmities and original disease, and not the contempt of Him and His law. Further, the promises appertain to such as repent. Therefore Isaiah said without exception, that the infirmities of all men were cast upon His blessed shoulder. It is our office, therefore, to see we exclude not ourselves from the general grace promised to all men. It is not a Christian man's part to attribute his salvation to his own free will with the Pelagian, and extenuate original sin; nor to make God the author of ill and our damnation, with the Manichee: nor yet to say, God hath written fatal laws, as the Stoic, and with necessity of destiny violently pulleth one by the hair into heaven, and thrusteth the other headlong into hell. But ascertain thyself by the Scripture, what be the causes of reprobation, and what of election. The cause of rejection or damnation is sin in man, which will not hear, neither receive the promise of the Gospel; or else, after he hath received it, by accustomed doing of ill, falleth either into a contempt of the Gospel, and

SECT. VII.

will not study to live thereafter, or else hateth the Gospel, because it condemneth his ungodly life, and would there were neither God nor Gospel to punish him for doing of ill," &c. "This sentence is true, howsoever men judge of predestination: God is not the cause of sin, nor would have man to sin. 'Thou art not a God that hath pleasure in wickedness:' and it is said, 'O Israel, thou hast destroyed thyself: but in Me is thine help.' The cause of our election is the mercy of God in Christ. Howbeit, he that will be partaker of this election must receive the promise in Christ by faith. For, therefore are we elected, because afterwards we are made the members of Christ. Therefore, as in the justification or remission of sin there is a cause, though no dignity at all, in the receiver of his justification, and so we judge him by the Scripture to be justified, and to have remission of his sin, because he received the grace promised in Christ: so we judge of election by the event or success that happeneth in the life of man, those only to be elected that by faith apprehend the mercy promised in Christ."

Ps. 5. 4.
Hos. 13. 9.
Eph. 1.
Rom. 8.

Nothing surely can be plainer than all this, as opposed to those pernicious doctrines of some whom he elsewhere calls *evangelicals*, and which, derived from the writings of Calvin, were beginning to spread in England during the holy Martyr's time. For he clearly teaches, 1st, that to the sin and misery which we derive from the first Adam, the grace of Christ the second Adam is so entirely equal, that no one incurs eternal damnation on account of original sin alone. 2ndly, that Christ bore on His Cross the infirmities of all men without exception. 3rdly, that men are by no means drawn to salvation or thrust into hell fire by a fatal necessity. 4thly, that the sole cause of reprobation is sin in man, not any kind of sin, but only a contempt of the word or grace of God which has been solemnly offered him. Nay, he even goes farther than this, and teaches, 5thly, that man is therefore chosen by God from everlasting, because in after time he was made a member of Christ, (which perhaps is intended in the seventeenth article of our Church by the phrase, 'chosen in Christ.') 6thly, and lastly, that the election of man from everlasting, although it have for its object, man embracing the grace of Christ by faith, still is entirely gratuitous: just

as justification, which takes place in time, is altogether gratuitous, notwithstanding the condition of faith is required in him that is to be justified. Should the reader wish to know more on this subject, he may be referred to the remainder of this same preface, and also to the seventeenth and nineteenth chapters of the work itself. SECT. VII.

§ 29. It must carefully be observed, that this last passage from Bishop Hooper is in great measure transcribed nearly word for word from Philip Melancthon, who drew up the Augsburg Confession; whose doctrines, as I have elsewhere mentioned, were adopted by the first movers of our Reformation, as being especially agreeable to Scripture and the teaching of the ancient Church, while they rejected Calvin's tenets. For my own part, I have no doubt of my assertion, but without taking my opinion, the reader can judge for himself in the following passage from his Loci Theologici: treating of Predestination, he says, "There is always much dispute touching the cause of election; as for instance, Cain and Abel disputed on the cause of one being preferred to the other; and again Esau and Jacob, and generally, those persons who only know the teaching of reason or the law, think of some human judge, and thence infer that a law or our own merits and worthiness are the causes of election. So thought the Jews, and so most writers on the Sentences have written. We, on the other hand, hold these three positions: first, we have no right to form our judgment about election either from reason or law, but from the Gospel: secondly, the whole number of those who are to be saved for Christ's sake are elected; wherefore, unless we have the knowledge of Christ, we can say nothing about election: thirdly, we must not look for one cause for justification, and a different one for election. Peter is elected because he is a member of Christ: so also is he righteous, that is, pleasing to God, because by faith he was made a member of Christ. As therefore, when we speak of justification, we start from the Gospel, or from the knowledge of the voice of the Gospel, so when we are going to speak about election, we must know the voice of the Gospel: so must we form our judgments, who are bound to begin from the knowledge of Christ and of His Gospel. Let us seek therefore for the promise in

Corp. Theol. p. 559. [Op. vol. i. p. 257.]

sententiarii.

SECT. VII.

which God has declared His will, and let us be sure that there is no other will to be sought for concerning grace beside the Word," &c. Soon after he says, "It is certain that this is the cause of reprobation, namely, sin in men who neither hear nor receive the Gospel, or who reject the faith before they depart hence. In such as these, their own sins and carnal will are the cause of their reprobation. For most true is it, that God is not the cause of sin, neither willeth sin. For the Psalmist saith, 'For Thou art the God that hast no pleasure in wickedness;' and Hosea, 'O Israel, thou hast destroyed thyself: but in Me is thine help.' Saul by his own will lost the Holy Spirit, of his own will opposed His holy motions. Thus much is certain touching the cause of rejection or reprobation: for a promise requireth faith. But on the other hand, it is rightly affirmed, that the cause of election is mercy in the will of God, Who wills not the destruction of all mankind, but for His Son's sake gathers together and preserves His Church. This is St. Paul's meaning, when in Rom. 9. 15, he quotes the saying, 'I will have mercy on whom I will have mercy.' He is denying that men were elected for the law's sake, or for any prerogative of race, that it may be clearer that the Church is elected and built for His Son's sake: nevertheless, in the receiver there must be an apprehension of the promise, namely, the knowledge of Christ. For for this cause are we elected, because we are members of Christ. Therefore we say that in justification there is a certain cause in the receiver, not worthiness, but in that he apprehends the promise, together with which the Holy Spirit operates; as St. Paul says, 'Faith cometh of hearing;' and thus we judge concerning election, *a posteriori*, viz. that without doubt they are elected who apprehend by faith the mercy promised through Christ, and retain that faith unto the end." Who does not now see that Bishop Hooper had imbibed much of Melancthon's teaching? The following words occur in the same passage: "So when it is said in St. John, 'No man can come to Me except the Father which hath sent Me draw him,' it immediately follows, 'Every man therefore that hath heard and hath learned of the Father, cometh unto Me.' God begins and draws us by His Word and Holy Spirit: but it is our duty to hear and

Ps. 5. 4.
ch. 13. 9.
Ex. 33. 19.
Joh. 6. 44.

learn, that is, to apprehend the promise, not oppose ourselves, or indulge in hesitation or doubt." Bishop Hooper, a little after the last passage quoted from him, gives precisely the same explanation. "John saith, 'No man cometh to Me, except My Father draw him.' Many men understand these words in a wrong sense, as though God required in a reasonable man no more than in a dead post, and do not attend to the words that follow; 'Every man that hath heard and hath learned of the Father, cometh to Me.' God draweth with His Word and the Holy Ghost, but man's duty is to hear and learn, that is to say, receive the grace offered, consent to the promise, and not repugn the God that calleth." These quotations, though by the way, have not been I trust in vain. SECT. VII.

§ 30. We now come to our other witness, the pious Latimer. He too, like his associate Hooper, supports and defends the teaching of Melancthon in many passages; a few of which I will now quote. In his Sermon preached on Septuagesima Sunday, we read: "But when we are about this matter, (namely election,) and are troubled within ourselves whether wee bee elect or no: we must ever have this maxime or principall rule before our eyes, namely, that God beareth a good will towards us. But you will say, how shall I know that? or how shall I believe that? we may know God's will towards us through Christ, God hath opened Himself unto us by His Sonne Christ. For so saith St. John the Evangelist: *Filius qui est in sinu Patris ipse revelavit*, that is, 'The Sonne which is in the bosome of the Father, He hath revealed.' Therefore we may perceive His good will and love towards us, He hath sent the same His Son into this world, which hath suffered most painfull death for us. Shall I now think that God hateth me? Or shall I doubt of His love towards me? Heere you see how you shall avoyd the scrupulous and most dangerous question of the predestination of God. For if thou wilt enquire His counsailes, and enter into His consistory, thy wit will deceive thee, for thou shalt not be able to search the counsailes of God. But if thou begin with Christ and consider His coming into the world, and dost believe that God hath sent Him for thy sake, to suffer for thee, and deliver thee from Lat. Sermons, part iii. p. 213.

SECT. VII.

sin, death, the devill, and hell, then when thou art so armed with the knowledge of Christ, this simple question cannot hurt thee; For thou art in the book of life which is Christ Himself. Also we learne by this sentence, *Multi sunt vocati:* 'that many are called:' that the preaching of the Gospel is universall, that it pertaineth to all mankind: That it is written, *In omnem terram exivit sonus eorum,* 'Through the whole earth their sound is heard.' Now seeing that the Gospel is universall, it appeareth He would have all mankind saved, and that the fault is not in Him if we be damned. For it is written thus. *Deus vult Omnes homines salvos fieri,* 'God would have all men to be saved.'" The remainder of the sermon should be read, which for brevity sake is now omitted. In the sermon also on the first Sunday after Epiphany we read, "For if the most part be damned, the fault is not in God but in themselves; for it is written, *Deus vult omnes homines salvos fieri,* 'God would that all men should be saved.' But they themselves procure their owne damnation." And again in the same sermon, "Think that God hath chosen those that believe in Christ, and that Christ is the booke of life: If thou believest in Him, then thou art written in the booke of life, and shalt be saved. So we need not go about to trouble ourselves with curious questions of the predestination of God." Where he says, "If thou believest in Him, then thou art written in the book of life," we must understand a persevering faith; and that this is his meaning is plain, from what he says immediately after: "So we may be in the booke one time, and afterward when we forget God and His Word, and doe wickedly, we come out of the booke," which words have been already quoted on the subject of perseverance. Lastly, (to omit many passages of the same purport,) the holy Father in his sixth sermon on the Lord's Prayer, when speaking against the Novatian heresy, says, "Christ alone, and none else, hath merited remission, justification, and so eternal blessedness for all those who will believe this; they who will not believe it, will not enjoy them. For Christ poured forth no less a portion of His blood for Judas than for Peter; Peter believed and was saved, Judas would not believe and therefore was he damned, and he himself the sole author of his damnation."

Ps. 19. 4.

Rom. 10. 18.

Part iii. p. 207.

Part ii. p. 92.

Good Lord! for what times hast Thou reserved us! If this holy Martyr were now alive, and were either to write or preach these same doctrines, how would the zealots of these days exclaim against him, as one accursed! how would they not bespatter him with the name of heretic, Pelagian, Arminian, and the like reproaches! Forsooth these gentlemen boast about their agreement with the first movers of our Reformation, and yet meanwhile they defame in the ears of the unlearned as innovators, and endeavour in every way to oppress, those who teach nothing but what those holy men taught before them. But I forbear. SECT. VII.

§ 31. From what has already been said concerning the doctrine of our Church, the reader will perceive with what judgment Dr. Tully attributed the following words to those whom he calls innovators: namely, that "the Fathers of our Reformation were good men, but savoured somewhat of Calvinism or fanaticism." Here certainly Dr. Tully is altogether mistaken: no one of these innovators in his senses would have said this. For allowing, as we do, that Calvin was a man of great ability, and in many points of much service in the Reformation, still it must be quite clear that the first movers of the Reformation were entirely opposed to him as well in discipline as in doctrine, in so far as he differed both from Melancthon and other more ancient teachers of a restored and purer Christianity. For granting these two positions, 1st, that Christ has truly redeemed even those who perish: 2ndly, that it is possible for those who really believe in Christ, and have been justified by Him, thoroughly to fall away through their own fault, from faith and justification, and to perish everlastingly, (and these are plain and undoubted doctrines of our Church,) the whole system and machinery of what is called Calvinism falls to the ground: and this will presently be plain to any one who shall pay the least attention to the subject. Now it is of no use to refer here to the article on predestination: nor shall I enter into a controversy with any one on any predestination of God so maintained as not to overturn these two fundamental points clearly laid down by our Church. I contend for this one thing only: that on account of the uncertain and various ideas and speculations of God's secret predestination, we Justif. Paul. p. 26.

SECT. VII.

must not deny such clear and established doctrines both of Scripture and of our own and the Catholic Church as these are, but rather believe that these secret things are so to be explained by what is revealed and plain to us, that the one may be consistent with the other: which a learned prelate some time since recommended. Our Church in her seventeenth article has so cautiously given the doctrine of predestination, that no Catholic can have any cause for rejecting the article, especially if Hooper (who took a leading part in the Synod which first sent forth our Articles), or Bishop Latimer his contemporary, be considered a competent interpreter of its words. But even after our Church had so prudently and cautiously explained this doctrine, she altogether draws away her sons from any speculation respecting it, and disallows that our life was to be directed by any conception concerning predestination, as by a rule: on the contrary, she teaches that "God's promises must be received in such wise, as they be generally set forth to us in Holy Scripture: and in our doings, that Will of God is to be followed, which we have expressly declared to us in the Word of God."

Art. 17.

This also the Augsburg divines had done before. "There is no need here" (say they, when treating of faith) "of disputations about predestination, and the like: for the promise is universal." In truth, for the first four centuries no Catholic ever dreamed about that predestination which many at this day consider the basis and foundation of the whole Christian religion: those excellent Christians, glorious both in their lives and death, lived and died relying on such grounds as these: that Christ is the common Saviour of mankind: that no one to whom the Gospel of Christ was known could possibly attain unto heavenly blessedness without obedience to the Gospel commands: that without grace and the Spirit of Christ, it was impossible to keep those commands: that the grace of God did not effect the salvation of man without his own diligence co-operating with it: that such grace was withheld from no man: that he who had been put into a state of salvation through the grace of God, might by his own fault fall therefrom, and perish everlastingly: and thence, that it was his duty who stood to

take heed lest he fall. Such axioms, I say, as these, and the like, were the rule of their lives. Touching the providence of God, they were satisfied in believing[n] that God knows beforehand all the actions of all men, and that He also rules and disposes the same as seemeth best to His wisdom, justice, and goodness, saving always that liberty which He has given to man, ever continuing unencroached upon. Whether from those more minute definitions of the predestination of God, which were made in the heated controversy of St. Augustine with Pelagius, any gain accrued to Catholic truth[o], Christian piety, and the peace of the Church: or whether we have not rather thence to lament over schism and very grievous errors, (as those of the Predestinarians,) and a falling off in the morals of men, let those well taught in the history of the Church decide. To conclude, then, let us heartily embrace and reverence that most wise decree of our King prefixed to the Articles. "That, therefore, in these both curious and unhappy differences, which have for so many hundred years in different times and places exercised the Church of Christ, We will that all further curious search be laid aside, and these disputes shut up in God's promises, as they be generally set forth to us in the Holy

SECT. VII.

[n] "Ancient opinions on this matter being reviewed, nearly all were found to agree upon the way in which they should understand the purpose and predestination of God according to His foreknowledge: namely, that God had made some vessels to honour, some to dishonour, for this reason, because He foresaw the end of each, and foreknew what would be his will and actions under the help of His grace."—Prosper, Epistle to Augustine on the Remains of the Pelagian heresy, near the end.

[o] Hilary (of Arles or Syracuse) in his Epistle to Augustine, 'de Massilensium Sententia,' says that there were those amongst the Catholics who though they dare not say that the dogma of Augustine on absolute predestination was entirely false, yet did say, both that it was new, and that it might be kept silent without any danger to the more confirmed, and that it would be taught with great peril to the weaker brethren. His words are (see Cassander's Works, Paris, 1616. p. 648): "In short, when we were all worn out, their pleading or rather complaint was turned to this; with the agreement of those who did not dare to disapprove of this definition, they said, What was the use of troubling the minds of so many of less knowledge with these uncertain disputations? For with no less advantage has the Catholic Faith been defended, without this definition, for so many years, by so many writers, by so many books, both of your own and others, as well against other heretics as especially against the Pelagians." Cælestinus, Bishop of Rome, with his clergy, in his Epistle to the Bishops of Gaul, gave the same opinion on these new statements of Augustine (Epist. for Prosper and Hilary on the grace of God. See Cassian's Works, 1628. p. 905. towards the end). "The more deep and difficult parts" (they say) "of the questions before us, which those who have withstood heretics have handled at greater length, as we do not dare despise them, so we do not hold it necessary to support them."

SECT. VII. Scripture, and the general meaning of the Articles of the Church of England according to them."

I could also bring forward other tenets of the Doctor, in which he has departed from the judgment of the English Church: but these are of less importance, and what I have already said will abundantly prove our point, namely, that Dr. Tully, in certain points of Christian doctrine, teaches altogether contrary to the English, and others of the chief reformed Churches, and even of the Catholic Church. And now let us return to his Justification as taught by St. Paul.

SECTION VIII.

ON THE REMAINING CHAPTERS.

§ 1. Every thing that Dr. Tully has brought forward against the author of the Harmony in the remaining chapters of his work, at least whatever was of importance, has been refuted at some length in our Examination of the Censure. In truth, the Censurer had already taken out of his hands nearly all matter for argument. And indeed, those short strictures or censures, which, as it seems, he wrote on the margin of my book, however little they amount to, look more like a fair answer than what Dr. Tully has replied to us in this his elaborate work. I shall leave it to the candid reader to decide whether I say this truly or not.

Just. Paul. p. 46. I confess, some of Dr. Tully's arguments are peculiarly his own! as for instance; "All the works commanded in the Divine law, are in justification opposed to grace: all kinds of good works are commanded in such a law: therefore they are so far opposed to grace." According to which argument, 'faith' and 'repentance,' commanded in the Gospel law, are 'works opposed to grace:' and this too, because they are commanded in some law: as if it were repugnant to grace and the liberty of the Gospel for a Christian to be under

Just. Paul. p. 47. obligation to some law. Again, (and he is excessively pleased with this argument,) "If we are justified by works, not on account of any worthiness in them, what is there to prevent our being justified by indifferent works, as well as

ἀδιαφόροις by good ones?" As if indeed there were no good work intermediate between an indifferent and a meritorious one,

and by which we are disposed and rendered fit to receive the free gifts of God; which 'fitness' is sometimes called in Scripture 'worthiness[p]:' or as if any of us had detracted the worthiness of this 'fitness' from good works, or attributed that of merit to them: or, lastly, as if it were true that a man was made fit to receive Divine blessings as well by indifferent as by good works. He, indeed, must have much leisure who has time to refute at any length such sophistry as all this. It therefore would have been enough for me to let these remaining chapters go without any further answer, had not certain monstrous calumnies stopped me, (I would with Dr. Tully that the indignity of the thing admitted of milder expressions!) and which, unless I wished to appear altogether careless about my reputation, it was necessary for me to answer.

SECT. VIII.

dignitas

ideoneitas

§ 3. In his fifth chapter, Dr. Tully says that "the Harmonist mildly attacks the orthodox who are opposed to him under the name of Solifidians: and that with him and his companions all are Solifidians who would separate this 'bugbear' of works from righteousness: namely, the Fathers, the English, and all the reformed Churches." And yet he, the very same person, in another place confesses that "I am not averse to an alliance with those veteran champions and leaders, but that I rather anxiously court one:" he acknowledges that "I at least pretend that all the Confessions of the reformed Church, or at least the chief of them, are on my side." What consistency is there in all this? Certainly, I never intended to declare war against the reformed Church, not to say against the Fathers. This

p. 43.

Just. Paul. p. 13.

p. 28.

[p] "In the Holy Scriptures the faithful are called 'worthy,' in this or that respect, not because their merits are equal or commensurate to the obtaining such a thing, but because they are so disposed, that according to the Divine dispensation they are fit persons to whom God shall be pleased to give such a reward. The word 'worthiness' therefore does not prove that there is any merit, properly so termed, in him who is called worthy of the kingdom of heaven, but only shews that he has that disposition or that fitness which God requires beforehand in those to whom the kingdom of heaven is given. For as he that is truly contrite is said to be worthy of pardon, not because the contrition itself merits pardon, but because it is that disposition to which God has determined to grant pardon, so the believer who strives after holiness is said to be worthy the kingdom of heaven, not because our faith or holiness merit heaven of condignity, but because there is in them that fitting disposition, to which the kingdom of heaven is promised by God, the Father of mercies," &c.—Davenant on actual righteousness, ch. lx. p. 605, 606.

SECT. VIII.

however I constantly affirm, (which also I have proved above,) that there are very many persons who though they chatter of nothing more than of Fathers and reformed Churches, nevertheless are very far from the true doctrine either of the Fathers or of the most ancient reformed Churches; and they surely deserve to be called Solifidians who attribute justification to 'faith only,' a single virtue to the exclusion of true repentance, as being in nowise necessary for obtaining justification. I leave it to the judgment of all to decide whether I have not proved Dr. Tully to be guilty of this Solifidianism, and have not liberated the Church of England and the rest of the reformed Churches from that charge. Not content, however, with these accusations, Dr. Tully thus proceeds in his attacks upon the Harmonist and his friends. "What more can be said, but that these and the like 'stigmata' branded upon the truth, if they are not to be time-serving, which is much to be feared, are either the follies of sciolists, or the calumnies of malicious persons?" Which is just as much as saying the Harmonist and his friends are either fools or rogues. No sensible person will care to be despised as a fool or sciolist by the Doctor who shall just consider what kind of spirit manifests itself in nearly every thing he writes. But when he speaks of us as time-serving, this cannot be passed over in silence. Far be it from me to make the same answer as a great man once did to a charge not unlike the present: "Low and venal minds are wont to judge of others by themselves:" for I trust that it is far different with Dr. Tully. Nor will I say any thing for the Harmonist's friends, who are old enough to answer for themselves. But as far as I myself am concerned, I am as ignorant as man can be of that base art of so tempering my divinity that it may serve the times against the truth. When I first devoted myself to divinity and the Church, God knows how sincerely I did so, and how zealous and anxious were my desires for promoting His glory and the salvation of souls. For having experienced in my youth the immense mercy and favour of God towards most grievous sinners, that saying of our Lord to Peter was ever sounding in my years, "when thou art converted strengthen thy brethren." Hence, when the Church of England was well-nigh deserted by most of her own children, and openly

derided by her enemies, having been admitted to Holy Orders according to her rites, I devoted myself to her, and for some years served her almost gratuitously. And I can truly affirm that I have spent a large part of my patrimony in the service of the Church: for which duty I think I may surely claim this one reward, and with this I shall be content, namely, to be considered by the Doctor and others as a true son of the Church. Those doctrines for which Dr. Tully taunts me as an innovator and a temporizer, (though I know not for whom,) and which I am most persuaded are no other but the very decrees of the Catholic and our own Church, these I say, I have openly, freely, and constantly held and taught during the very overthrow both of our Church and kingdom, and was for so doing attacked on all sides by the hatred and reproaches of schismatics. But would that the reverend gentleman had not driven me to this foolishness of boasting! SECT. VIII.

§ 4. In the seventh chapter, Dr. Tully quotes an argument of mine from the Harmony, which is as follows. "In whatever sense St. Paul rejects ritual and external works as not necessary, in that sense he admits spiritual and internal works as necessary: but he rejects ritual works as not necessary to justification: therefore he admits spiritual works as necessary to justification." What is Dr. Tully's remark on this? He says, "How does he prove this false proposition, (not to say any thing stronger of it?) by perfect silence: as if it were a self-intelligible principle, or that a strong assertion of it was the same as proving the reason of it." Here is straightforwardness indeed! let any fair-minded person read the passage for himself and he will see that I confirmed the proposition by very weighty arguments. In the first place I prove it by most express passages of Scripture; as Gal. 5. 6; 6. 15; 1 Cor. 7. 19, where the Apostle opposes 'faith perfected by love,' 'a new creature,' 'the keeping of the commandments of God,' to 'circumcision,' and consequently to the rest of the Mosaic rites, and affirms of these that they are of no avail in Christ Jesus, that is, that they do not profit for the justification and salvation of man. But what he takes from these, (i. e. the 'Mosaic rites,') he evidently attributes to the others, to 'faith perfected by love, a

p. 57. Diss. ii. c. 14. § 4. p. 167.

αὐτονόητον διότι

SECT. VIII.

new creature, and the keeping of the commandments of God,' namely, that they are most necessary, and do avail greatly in the justification and salvation of man. To which passages I add the following, Col. 2. 11, 12, 13; Rom. 11. 28, 29; Phil. 3. 2, 3. With these premises I lay down the argu-

§4,5.p.167. ment that follows. Then I confirm my proposition by an argument taken from the primary end or object of the Mosaic ritual law: that God with no other design did exact under so severe penalties this external righteousness, than to shew that spiritual righteousness, to be more clearly revealed in the Gospel, and shadowed out in that legal righteousness, was equally and still more necessary: that as external justification, which was given by the law, was the shadow of the true justification to be obtained through Christ, so the circumcision of the flesh, which was required for that external justification, fully represented that circumcision of the heart, (namely by faith, repentance, and the true love of God,) which according to the Gospel is absolutely necessary for obtaining remission of sins or justification.

pro coronide

What can be plainer than this? Lastly, as a finish to what I had said, I give in a note a remarkable passage from Justin

p. 320. Paris 1636. [§ 92. p. 189.]

Martyr's Dialogue with Trypho: "We therefore, in the uncircumcision of our flesh believing in God through Christ, and having a circumcision profitable to us who possess it, namely, the circumcision of the heart, hope to appear righteous and well-pleasing in the sight of God." Where he clearly teaches that according to the Gospel not merely faith in God through Christ, but the circumcision of the heart, shadowed forth in that external circumcision of the Mosaic law, is absolutely required for any one who would be righteous and well-pleasing before God. And now let all honest men judge how fairly Dr. Tully could say that I had proved the proposition of my argument by mere silence.

p. 58.

§ 5. Shortly after, the reverend gentleman runs off into certain logical subtleties having nothing to do with the subject. He then returns to the Harmonist (whom he now styles the "Dissertator"), as follows: "But since the Dissertator in his postscript has candidly told us that the whole of the Harmony was written when he was quite young, without any mark, as it appears, of his having looked

SECT. VIII.

at it in maturer years, there is no reason why we should not put down this and the like passages to his youth." And not only in this place, but continually does he attack that honest avowal of mine, (as he allows it to be,) and in no very honest way. To these continual repetitions I make this one reply. It is true that I wrote the Harmony when I was about seven and twenty: but it is very far from the truth to say that I published it without looking it over in maturer years. For several years elapsed between its completion and its publication; in which interval I not only often read it over myself, but gave it to my more learned friends to censure it as they pleased, and in their hands it remained a long time. At length I submitted these Dissertations to the examination of a Right Reverend Prelate[q], William, Bishop of Gloucester, of blessed memory. The reader may learn what his opinion of them was from my dedicatory epistle to him, where with the greatest truth, (and if not, I should be the most barefaced man alive,) I thus addressed the learned Prelate. "The several chapters of each Dissertation were perused by you, (and that too, not without care,) your patience overcoming their tediousness; when read, you gave them your sanction, and what is more, with your accustomed kindness towards myself and all I do, adorned them with your praise." I repeat, and I appeal to God and man as my witnesses, that I wrote this with the greatest sincerity. And I say so the more readily, because Dr. Trumann, in the end of his book against me, says that he suspects I forged these commendations in order to gain credit for my doctrines by the approval of so great a Bishop and such a learned writer. I cannot tell indeed what must have been his disposition who could cherish within him so foul and malicious a suspicion of a man of whose fame he knew no ill, and of a Divine and Priest of the Church too; and in addition to this, did not blush to publish such a suspicion to the world. But since he has gone the way of all, I forbear to say more of him. But to return: when I was in my forty-second year, I read the Harmony over and over again with much care, having laid aside, as I hope, all self-conceit, and certainly having offered my prayers to the Lord, that He would be pleased to

[q] [Nicholson.]

SECT. VIII.

enlighten my mind with His heavenly light, and to shew me all the errors I had fallen into contrary to the truth; and I then solemnly vowed and promised openly and publicly to renounce, in the presence of the Church, such errors, when made known to me, to the sacrifice of my reputation. And now, if the reader wishes to know what was my own opinion after such a serious and accurate examination of my work, I say most candidly, that I saw more fully that there were some points in it which might have been stated with greater perspicuity and completeness, which I had partially seen when it was first published, and hence that avowal in the postscript which Dr. Tully attacks so often and so unkindly; and this deficiency I have endeavoured to make up as much as possible in the Examination of the Censure. I saw also that my interpretation of one or two of the more difficult passages in St. Paul's writings might admit of doubts, though a more sure explanation of them has not yet occurred to me. But as far as regards the main doctrine of man's justification, which I had to defend, and the meaning of the Apostles St. Paul and St. James, whose teaching I had undertaken to reconcile, I feel most persuaded that I have not erred from the truth, or from Catholic teaching. As for him who with so much pomposity is for ever attacking the youth of the Harmonist, I would that he had not written in advanced years that which accords so little with their sobriety.

p. 59. § 6. In the same chapter, Dr. Tully asserts that the Harmonist makes the whole weight of his cause depend on this foundation: namely, that the works which St. Paul excludes are only those which are performed without the grace of the Gospel by the aid of the natural or Mosaic law. And to prove this, he quotes the passage from my second Dissertation, xii. 2. p. 142; but if the reader will refer to that passage he will see that my meaning is far different: my words are: "Whoever thoroughly understands what we have advanced will easily perceive that the works which simpliciter St. Paul simply excludes from justification are only those which are performed without the grace of the Gospel by the aid of the natural or Mosaic law." So that Dr. Tully, as is his custom, omits the word *simply*, and yet in the headings

of the chapter, I had put that word in Greek in order to draw the reader's attention especially to it. Of course I grant that St. Paul excludes from justification all works, even those proceeding from grace 'in a certain sense,' namely, so far as to take away from them all merit of justification: but I assert most plainly that only that external, human, and carnal righteousness, prescribed by the letter of the Mosaic and consequently by the natural law, and which can be performed without the special grace of the Gospel,—I say that this alone is excluded by him from justification, 'simply and entirely,' as in no way necessary or profitable. We may refer the reader also to what has been said in our Examen, in the Answer to Stricture XX. 1. p. 200.

SECT. VIII.

κατά τι

ἁπλῶς simpliciter

§ 7. Again in the same chapter, Dr. Tully quotes from the Harmony the following passage as mine: "The law of Moses, by containing only temporal promises and threatenings, was 'of itself' inclined to produce in men a mean and sordid disposition, entirely foreign to true and genuine piety." And then he thus exclaims upon it: "What a saying! unworthy to be said or heard by a Christian. God gave His people a law 'of itself' inclined (not through accident or human frailty) to lead men from God," &c. Shall we call this divinity? surely it is more "dreadful than all the Calvinism they talk of." I am really quite ashamed and grieved to have to notice so often the want of honesty shewn by the Doctor, in quoting my words. Here he attributes the words "of itself" to me, and that the reader may have no doubt about it, takes care to have them printed in large letters. And yet he has added these words 'of itself' out of his own head, as any one may see who will look to the passage. How unworthy of a Christian, not to say of a divine, is this dishonesty! shall we call this straightforwardness? But what I really said, viz. that the law of Moses regarded by itself, and according to the letter, as the carnal Jews regarded it, from the very fact of its promises and threatenings being only temporal, and its precepts external and carnal, was inclined to produce in men a mean and sordid mind and disposition &c., this I have abundantly shewn to be both harmless, true, and certain, as also agreeable with the teaching both of ancient divines, and also of

p. 60. II. Diss. x. 4. p. 119.

SECT. VIII.

the inspired writers themselves, in my Examination of the Censure, in the Answer to Stricture XXII, whither I refer the reader. But for what purpose is this mention of Calvinism? Forsooth this Calvinism is a very tender subject with the Doctor, and he is much afraid for it, from those innovators as he styles them, and not without reason. But although Dr. Tully has given us a fair opportunity for disclosing the dreadful doctrines of Calvinism, we are unwilling at this time to moot the question: nor is it necessary, since all fair minds must perceive how shocking Calvinism is. As for Dr. Tully's lengthy arguments in this chapter against the Harmonist, touching the absence of the promise of eternal life in the Mosaic law, the reader will see that they have nothing at all to do with the subject, if he refers to the Examen.

Answers to Strictures XVIII, XIX, and XXI.

§ 8. In chapter eight, a very long one, Bellarmine and the "Aphorist" are chastised: not a word is said about the Harmonist. My own opinion of the imputation of Christ's righteousness is explained at length in the Examen.

Answer to Stricture XI.

In the ninth chapter, Dr. Tully returns to the Harmonist, and proposes certain of his arguments to be solved: but the reader will see how wishy-washy his solutions are, by referring to the Harmony.

II. Diss. iv. 8, 9. p. 60—63.

In the tenth chapter, the Harmonist again has the privilege of being left alone. To Dr. Tully's arguments on the nature of justifying faith, I make the same answer as I have done at length on the same subject in the Examen.

Answer to Stricture XIII.

§ 9. In the eleventh chapter the Harmonist is again and again attacked by the way: but in vain, as will be seen by any one who will take the trouble to compare what I have written with Dr. Tully's work. With regard to the object of the whole of this chapter, in which the reverend gentleman endeavours to prove that my teaching on the point of justification agrees very nicely with that of the Papists, I make the following few remarks by way of answer. I have already shewn that the sum of my teaching concerning man's justification is as follows: No one under the Gospel covenant, which has been procured and ratified by the sole meritorious outpouring of the Blood of Jesus Christ, can possibly obtain remission of sins or justification without faith and repentance;

and without the fruits of faith and repentance, no one can possibly preserve his justification. If the Papists hold no other doctrine on this point, we may seriously congratulate them on their orthodoxy, as far as it goes, and on their agreement with Scripture and the Church Catholic, as well as with our own and the reformed Churches. We neither like nor seek for unnecessary disagreements; inasmuch as we know full well that there are already too many chief points in Christian doctrine on which the Papists disagree most widely, not only with us, but with the Apostles, and Doctors of the primitive Church. Indeed, Field has proved most excellently and at great length, how fully we agree with the more sound amongst the Roman divines, who wrote either before or after the Council of Trent, on the subject of justification. And if Dr. Tully had ever read with attention the Dissertation of that great divine, he would certainly have omitted the whole of his eleventh chapter. There are certainly several Roman Catholic divines, and Bellarmine amongst them, who have not hesitated to attribute the merit of 'condignity' to good works in procuring at least our second justification. Does Dr. Tully mean to assert that we approach this blasphemy? indeed he does: how unfairly, we will presently shew in this same section. But first, I demand how and with what arguments does he prove this heavy accusation? he refers to the sixth chapter of his book, where he boasts that he has proved this conclusion of the merit of condignity to be but too consequent (as he expresses himself) upon our principles. But what is it he endeavours to prove there? namely, that "to be justified by works, or on account of works, or by the merit of works, mean all one and the same thing." Where he either argues extremely sophistically, or else his meaning must be, that to be justified by works, as the necessary 'condition' on our part, to be performed by the grace of God, and to be justified by works as 'the meritorious causes' of our justification, mean the same thing. But who in his senses can assert this? and yet the whole of the Doctor's argument turns on this point. But if there is still need of authority on a point that must be quite clear to all persons who are not destitute of common sense, let us hear that famous passage of Davenant, already quoted at length in

SECT. VIII.

Appendix to B. iii. on the Church. ch. 2. on Justification.

ex condigno

Just. Paul. p. 124.

ἰσοδυναμοῦντα

SECT. VIII.

On actual righteousness, ch. 31. p. 404.

the Harmony: "And here it is to be observed," says he, "that when we say any thing is necessary for obtaining this or that, from the very force of the words, the necessity of causality is not meant, but of order. Therefore, although I grant the following statement, 'good works are necessary for justification,' it cannot be immediately inferred that they are necessary as causes, much less as meritorious causes. For instance, if I say it is necessary for obtaining the rank of a knight that a man should go to court, and go down on his knees before the king, it would be folly to infer from thence that the going to court or the genuflexion were the meritorious causes of his obtaining this honour. And thus we must look upon all those works which are said to be necessary on our part for justification."

§ 10. But supposing this charge to fall back upon the Doctor? what if we were to shew that Dr. Tully's doctrine of justification agrees entirely with that of the Papists, especially in that point (as he somewhere else says) where it is most papistical: it would not be very hard to prove this. Some of the Papists teach (and they certainly have the divines of Trent to lead them in their error) that true contrition for sin is not absolutely necessary for obtaining remission of sins or justification: but that attrition only in many cases is sufficient. Now is not Dr. Tully's teaching the same? surely it is, for he acknowledges that some kind of repentance indeed is necessarily required for man's justification, but most entirely denies that true repentance or contrition must precede justification. In fact, in this point Dr. Tully's view is more lax and worse than that of the Papists; for they merely assert that attrition only is in many cases sufficient; he, that contrition is not necessarily requisite in any one for justification: they, beside attrition, require confession and some kind of satisfaction; he warmly contends that man can obtain justification by attrition alone, assisted by some sort of faith, I know not what, but certainly not revealed to us in the Gospel. But enough on this point.

Council of Trent, Sess. 14. c. 4. on contrition.

Just. Paul. p. 30, 31.

§ 11. In the twelfth or last chapter, the reconciliation of St. Paul and St. James is treated of, where the Harmonist is attacked on all sides. And here I must beg the reader to

SECT. VIII.

read seriously and impartially the first and second chapters of the second Dissertation, as also Examen Censuræ, Answer to Stricture XV. 6—8, and he will see to what little purpose Dr. Tully has devoted his time and labour. There are, however, certain things which may not be passed over. The author of the Harmony had proved that St. James denies not only that a false faith but that even a true faith has the sole office of justifying; and by this argument amongst others: "That faith which was in Abraham undoubtedly was a true faith, and not a mere resemblance; but this very faith of Abraham could not justify him without works, for it is said, 'Was not Abraham our father justified by works.'" Listen to Dr. Tully's answer to this argument: "How could it escape him," says he, "that his opponents deny this justification to have been in the sight of God? This then is 'begging the question,' than which there is not a more troublesome kind of false argument; and this is not to argue, but to trifle and waste good time to ill purpose." But how, I ask, could it escape Dr. Tully, that before I made use of this argument I had clearly proved in the foregoing chapter that St. James is speaking of justification before God? Read, read, I pray you, ye who are lovers of the truth, the first chapter of Diss. II. § 4, and you will acknowledge that I had proved this very point by five most clear and certain arguments. But what does Dr. Tully say to them? not a syllable: surely then we may fairly retort upon him his own words, and say, "This certainly is not to argue, but to trifle and waste good time to ill purpose."

II. Diss. ii. 4. p. 48.

Jas. 2. 21.

Just. Paul. p. 140.

§ 12. In the same chapter, Dr. Tully seriously warns the author of the Harmony as follows: "Meanwhile I must seriously advise the dissertator to be reconciled with himself, to make peace at home. For if justifying faith be separable from love, (for which he is here warmly contending,) how can it have united to it the true Gospel worship of God? as he himself has determined. How does it comprehend the whole of religion? How, lastly, (to pass over other points,) is the whole of Gospel obedience expressed by the word 'faith?' What contradiction is all this!" Now we must seriously advise Dr. Tully to have for the future a greater love for truth and honesty. For

p. 164.

p. 65.

p. 68, 69.

SECT. VIII.

when, I ask, has the author of the Harmony ever said (not to say warmly contended) that justifying faith is separable from love? Where has Dr. Tully found such an opinion of the author? Perhaps (to use his own words) in the archives of Utopia; for certainly you may look through the whole Harmony from beginning to end and you will find nothing of the kind. I do say, indeed, (though I do not warmly contend for it, inasmuch as I have clearly said that it is a question plainly irrelevant to our cause,) that a true, and in its kind a perfect faith may be found where love is wanting. I mean, that the single virtue of Christian faith is nothing more than a firm assent of the mind to the Gospel of Christ: but that whatever is added to this assent, either in the heart or will of man, is the effect of its being made efficacious through the grace of God, and belongs to the virtue of love: I have proved this at length in the Examen. Now Dr. Tully himself, and by far the greatest part of reformed divines, acknowledge with me that this firm assent to the Gospel may be separated from love. But I never said or even dreamed that justifying faith was separable from love. On the contrary, I am continually asserting that as often as justification and salvation are attributed in the Scriptures to faith, we must not understand them to mean faith as a single virtue, but faith in a complex sense, namely, faith perfected by love.

Harm. II. Diss. iv. 7. p. 60.

Answer to Stricture XIII.

§ 13. Dr. Tully's arguments in his Appendix, concerning the necessity of good works, which, however, are by no means necessary to justification, also of the conditions required and commanded in the Gospel, and of the difference between a right to a thing and a right in a thing: all these have been fully refuted in the Examen. Let the reader refer to those passages and judge for himself. I cannot, however, pass over an instance of most evident calumny, joined to downright dishonesty, which occurs in p. 174; and I heartily wish that he himself did not compel me to use such harsh expressions: but he there gives the argument of the Harmonist in the following words. "But he proceeds from other sources in this syllogism, viz., from 2 Thess. 1. 7; Heb. 6. 10; and 2 Tim. 4. 8. If the reward of eternal life be given of justice to our works, then we

p. 167, et seq.

Answer to Strictures VII. 1—7. and XIV. 6.

gain by our works a right to that reward: but the passages just quoted confirm this, therefore, &c. The same proofs are also brought forward by Bellarmine, in support of his merit of works, which to me appears in no way to differ from this right of our Harmonist." Now who, I say, if he could depend on the Doctor's integrity and fairness, would not confidently declare that the writer of the Harmony was, at least in this article of justification, a downright Papist: and not only that, but that he entirely agreed with those among them who are more bigoted in supporting the merit of condignity? But again am I compelled to exclaim, Alas! for the man's honesty! I beseech the reader to look at the passage in the Harmony which Dr. Tully here perverts, where having quoted the celebrated passage from the Revelations, I subjoin the following remarks. "To this may be added, all those passages of the New Testament, in which eternal life is clearly declared to be given by the Almighty of His justice to our works. From these texts we may thus argue. If the reward of eternal life is due of right to our works, then from our works we obtain a right to that reward: (such a right certainly as hath its only foundation in the gracious covenant of God, through Christ.) The terms are relative and correlative: to whom a reward is given of right, he hath a right to that reward necessarily, and the converse." Now Dr. Tully has omitted these words; "such a right certainly as hath its only foundation in the gracious covenant of God, through Christ." Perhaps he supposed he might justly pass them over, because they were written in a parenthesis. Certainly he might, if Dr. Tully professed to be merely a rhetorician or a grammarian, and not to be a Christian, not a theologian, not a doctor of divinity. In truth, my meaning and opinion in this argument might be so clearly understood from this parenthesis, that there could be no room for this sort of cavilling. Nor is it any excuse for him, that he afterwards acknowledges that I say the right which our good works have to eternal life hath its only foundation in the gracious covenant of God through Christ. For he does not bring forward this statement of mine at once in its proper place, but after several remarks of his own, and as it were by the

I. Diss. vi. 11. p. 38, 39.

ch. 22. 14. 2 Thess. 1. 7; Heb. 6. 10; 2 Tim. 4. 8.

SECT. VIII.

way, and so separated from the parts of the sentence to which it belonged, that the reader might easily be led to believe that I had equally brought forward this argument just as crudely as it is quoted by him, and that this sounder statement had been made by me in some other part, as if I had forgotten what I had said before. In addition to all this, he has not even here quoted my words as they stand, but has weakened the sentence, omitting the word 'only,' on which the true understanding of what I mean principally depends. However, forgiving him this piece of dishonesty, he has still by no means rid himself of the charge of false testimony. He says that the right which the Harmonist attributes to good works, appears to him to differ in nothing from Bellarmine's notion of merit. Now, I ask, has he ever read Bellarmine on this subject, or not? If he has, he cannot possibly believe that I agree with him. But if he has not, he is deciding very rashly on the comparison of Bellarmine's opinion and my own, and that too in a very serious matter. To make things more clear, let us compare Bellarmine's teaching with the Harmonist's. The Harmonist, in that very place which Dr. Tully rails at, expressly teaches that the right to eternal life which must be given to our good works, "is such as hath its only foundation in the gracious covenant of God, through Christ." And in other passages throughout the whole work, he so plainly rejects every notion of the right or merit of our good works to eternal life, which is not founded only in the gracious promise of the Gospel, that any one who has even a grain of fairness or modesty remaining, would blush to affirm the contrary. Look, in the first place, to the following passage in the Harmony; there, amongst others, is the following statement: "Whoever then regards his salvation must guard against that calculating pride, and call not Almighty God to account as if in any degree indebted to him. He will remember that the right which the good works of the just have to eternal life, is founded only in the Gospel covenant and promise, the source of which covenant and promise is the mere and wonderful mercy of God the Father, through God the Son." To illustrate this doctrine, I quote several celebrated passages from the ancient divines. Lastly, so entirely do I

II. Diss. xviii. 4, 5. p. 195, 196.

attribute every thing to the grace and mercy of God, and so utterly do I repudiate all notion of merit in our works, that I deny that God can, even from His promise, be properly called our 'debtor.' My words are; "Although even these expressions are somewhat improper, and therefore Thomas and the other schoolmen preferred saying that God made Himself a debtor by His promises, not to us, but to Himself, i. e. to His own determination, it being agreeable to His truth that He should perform His promises." It may now be seen what kind of right the Harmonist attributes to our works. Let us now turn to Bellarmine. In his fifth book on Justification, he proposes this question for consideration. "Whether good works are meritorious of condignity by reason of a covenant only? or by reason of the work only? or by reason of both?" He then proceeds to determine this question, as follows: "The view which takes in somewhat of both, seems to me more probable, and which teaches that the good works of the just merit eternal life of condignity by reason of the covenant and the work together. Not indeed because a good work is not proportionate to eternal life without a covenant or acceptation: but because God is not bound to accept a good work for that reward, however proportionate and equal it may be to the reward, without some intervening agreement. Which view we do not doubt is agreeable to that of the Council of Trent," &c. Whence it appears that according to Bellarmine (with whom Suarez also agrees[r]) the system of merit of condignity is made up of two things, namely, the intrinsic worthiness of the work, and the promise of God which is added to it; so that a good work, according as it is performed, though it possesses a sufficient proportion or value, with respect to the reward, still wants the promise of God only to produce obligation of the justice by which a reward is due to it. To take the following illustration: Suppose a person wished to buy a farm of another, and had offered him the just and fair price for it: the possessor

SECT. VIII.

p. 196.

[Op. vol. iv. p. 1309.] ch. 17.

ex condigno.

obligatio nem ex justitia

[r] "A debt of fidelity depends on the truth of the promise, but the debt of which we are now speaking, although it requires a promise, and is chiefly founded upon that, yet is commensurate with and proportionate to works." —Suarez in 3 Thom. vol. i. disp. 4. sect. 5. *Quod si*, &c.

SECT. VIII.

would be by no means bound to give up his right to the farm, without some free covenant or agreement having intervened on his own part. It is but too plain that this is Bellarmine's real meaning, as well from the passage just quoted, as from many others which continually occur in his writings. And one would think the Doctor should feel ashamed to have said that Bellarmine's view of merit differs in nothing from the right which the Harmonist gives to good works. And still more, to have asserted (as he does in the second chapter) that he agrees entirely with the Papists in general on this question of merit, not excepting even the most bigoted of them. For Bellarmine (with whom however we greatly differ) shewed much modesty and moderation in this controversy, above the other Papists. For there are not wanting divines in the Church of Rome, who confidently assert that the value and worthiness of life eternal is to be ascribed to our works without any covenant or favour on God's part: and consequently that neither the merits of Christ, nor the promise of God, nor any other agreement or favour, has any thing to do with the system of merit. For instance, this opinion is warmly and openly defended by Vasques, and Bellarmine brings forward Cajetan, Dominic a Soto, and others, as supporters of the same opinion.

In 1. 2æ. qu. 114. Disp. 214. ch. 4.

SECTION IX.

ON THE DISSERTATION ON THE MEANING OF ST. PAUL, ROM. 7. 14.

§ 1. It remains for us to examine more minutely Dr. Tully's Dissertation[s] on the meaning of St. Paul, Rom. 7. 14. et seq. Here he boasts exceedingly of his doings, and as usual assigns to himself the prize. But the proverb he uses may, we think, be deservedly applied in return to himself: "Let not him that girdeth on his harness boast himself as he that putteth it off." At the very beginning of this Dissertation, he taxes the author of the Harmony with great presumption, for daring to say that that view which makes St. Paul in Rom. 7.

1 Kings 20. 11.

Dissert. p. 2.

[s] [In which it is shewn that St. Paul is speaking of himself as regenerate, and not in the person of one still unregenerate.]

from ver. 14, to be speaking of himself, is full not only of great discrepancies, but of actual absurdities. But let a fair-minded person judge whether the writer of the Harmony has said any thing here which he has not plainly proved. SECT. IX.

§ 2. In order to prejudice the unlearned against my assertion, he thus proceeds: "Now in the first place, I wish he would seriously consider (if indeed he is aware of it, which I suppose he is) how many persons this invidious assertion assails. For supposing he has one or two of his new divines (be they ever so good) and some perhaps of the ancients on his side; does it follow from this that all the rest, so many, and at least equal to the others in learning, good sense, and piety, should be so very weak in intellect, that their interpretations are full of palpable absurdities?" Presently he adds, "I greatly suspect that amongst the supporters of these absurdities, you may find all the Fathers, especially the Latin, after care and keen search, were called into action owing to the heresy of Pelagius, and Hilary may be added to them before Pelagius." In fact he here intended to persuade the credulous reader, 1. That the author of the Harmony had not very many ancient divines on his side, whence he afterwards asserts that the far greater number of holy and learned doctors of the Church disagreed with him. 2. That all the Fathers after Pelagius, were nearly, if not entirely, opposed to the Harmonist. 3. That only one or two new divines of eminence favoured his opinion. And now we must shew how utterly false all this is. p. 1, 2. ἀγχίνοιαν p. 5.

§ 3. With regard to the first point, I assert, in opposition to the Doctor, that by far the greater part of the more ancient Fathers approve of the interpretation which I am defending. The learned and trustworthy G. Vossius adduces in support of it Irenæus, book iii. ch. 22; Tertullian on Chastity, ch. 17; Macarius, Hom. I.; Basil on Ps. 1.; and Exhortation on Baptism, the title of which is, "That they are to be advised and instructed who come to Baptism;" Cyril against Julian, book iii. and Epistle to Successus, and book i. De recta Fide ad Reginas; also Origen, Chrysostom, Theodoret, the writer of the commentaries attributed to Ambrose, and Theophylact in his notes on Rom. 7. Others of no less credit bring forward Cyprian, or another ancient Hist. of Pelag. B. ii. part i. thes. 2. p. 148. [ch. 20. § 3. p. 214.]

SECT. IX.

writer in the prologue on the Cardinal Works of Christ, Paulinus' second Epistle to Sulpitius Severus, Damascenus on Orthodox Faith, iv. 23. Estius, who is opposed to our interpretation, adds, of the Greeks, Œcumenius, and of the Latins, Sedulius: to whom Maximus is added by Grotius. To crown all, I will add out of my own collecting the testimonies of six ancient doctors, which, as far as I know, others have not before observed. One of these is the oldest of all: and another next to the oldest: all of them are sufficiently ancient and well known writers in the Church of Christ.

On Rom. 7. 14.

Discuss. p. 192.

p. 506. ed. Paris 1636. ἀκμήν

§ 4. Justin Martyr, in his Epistle to Zenas and Serenus. "For we are 'altogether' carnal, and in us dwelleth no good thing. Wherefore we must call in the physician to heal us, And he that is thus minded, shall be healed, and escape disease." Every one must see that the blessed Martyr is referring to that passage of St. Paul, Rom. 7; for the very words almost of the eighteenth verse of that chapter are quoted, and the words of the fourteenth verse, 'I am carnal,' are expressed by a clear paraphrase. Nor is it less plain that Justin applies the Apostle's words to man unregenerate, that is, as without the state of grace and salvation. For those words of the Apostle, 'I am carnal,' are paraphrased and explained by him by, 'we are wholly, entirely, altogether[t] carnal,' for that is the force of the word ἀκμὴν. So Isocrates to Demonicus, ἀκμὴν φιλοσοφεῖς, 'you are a regular' (or entirely a) 'philosopher.' Who would imagine that these words were said of man, regenerated by the Spirit of Christ. Then he expressly speaks of those who have not yet called in Christ the Physician, that is, those who are without Christ. Lastly, he speaks of the disease and vice from which they are liberated who have called in Christ as their physician. It is clear then that Justin Martyr, who lived immediately after the Apostles, entirely agreed with our interpretation. Clement of Alexandria, a very learned doctor in the Church, who lived in the second century, and was a pupil of the great Pantænus, after quoting the words of Plato, "The soul of the philosopher thinks but very little of

Strom. lib. iii. p. 433. [p. 518, 519.]

[t] [This is a mistake, as the word means only 'still;' which is however much more favourable to his general argument.]

SECT. IX.

the body, and seeks to be rid of it, and to be alone," adds, "and does he not somewhat agree with the divine Apostle, when he says, 'O wretched man that I am! who shall deliver me from the body of this death,' unless perchance their consent who are drawn into sin is figuratively called by him the body of death?" He is enquiring whether this passage of St. Paul at all agrees with Plato's opinion, and he corrects the mistake, and gives the Catholic exposition: viz. 'the body of death,' is there figuratively said of their consent who are drawn into sin, by which words the state of an unregenerate and even a wicked man, is clearly marked. Besides, he says 'their consent,' not 'his own,' plainly indicating that the Apostle is speaking in the person of others. Marcus Eremita, on Baptism, thus gives a question that some had asked. "Did not Paul therefore sin after he had been baptized, because he was willingly distracted? for he says, 'For I see another law in my members, warring against the law of my mind.'" He answers this question by saying, "In this way the evil-minded pervert the rest of the Scriptures, and err; for look at the former part of this chapter, and you will find that St. Paul is not speaking of himself after Baptism, but in the person of the unbelieving Jews, persuading them that without the grace of Christ which is given in Baptism, it is impossible to overcome sin." Where he classes those who explain this passage otherwise, with evil-minded people who pervert the Holy Scriptures. So Dorotheus: "The Son of God having become man, renewed fallen man, He freed him that was enslaved to sin, and overcome by its power. For man was dragged by violence and tyranny by the enemy under its yoke, and almost they who wished not to sin, sinned by force, as saith the Apostle of himself in our person; 'For the good that I would, I do not: but the evil which I would not, that I do.' God then becoming man for our sake, liberated man from the tyranny of the enemy." What follows may well be read. St. Pacian, Bishop, in a Sermon on Baptism: "What then is man's hope? without the law he perished because he could not see sin, and under the law also, because he went against that which he did see. Who can free him from this death? Hear the Apostle: 'O wretched man that I am! who shall deliver me from the

Biblioth. Patr. vol. i. p. 921, 922. Paris 1624.

Doctrina i. Biblioth. Patr. tom. i. p. 750.

Biblioth. Patr. tom. iii. p. 76.

[Bibl. Patr. Col. Agrip. 1618. vol. iv. p. 247.]

SECT. IX.

body of this death? I thank God (he says) through Jesus Christ our Lord.'" Ennodius in an Epistle to Constantine: "'For to will is present with me: but how to perform that which is good I find not.' What is this but saying, I know how to choose the right way: but unless supernatural grace assist me, I shall be weary while I walk thereon?"

Epist. lib. ii. Epist. 19. Bibl. Patr. tom. xv. p. 240. [vol. vi. p. 205. ed. 1618.]

§ 5. We have brought forward two-and-twenty approved doctors of the Church to support our view of this passage: and now then let Dr. Tully (to use his own words) 'muster and review' his forces, and compare them with ours. Out of all the Fathers who flourished in the three first centuries, and whose writings are now extant, there is only one, Methodius, who lived in the end of the third, who favours Dr. Tully's interpretation, though he does not bring him forward. And yet even his exposition is very different to theirs whom Dr. Tully follows, as Grotius has shewn at length. So that we are able to assert most plainly that our interpretation of this passage of St. Paul was commonly received and approved of by the primitive Church, which, without doubt, must have best understood the hard passages in the Sacred Oracles from the tradition of the true sense so lately derived from the Apostles themselves. Before Augustine's time, four doctors of the Church are produced by our opponents in support of their cause, viz. Methodius, whom we have just mentioned: Hilary, Gregory Nazianzen, and Ambrose. But I am not yet certain that Gregory Nazianzen did really understand the passage to speak of a person truly regenerate. Certainly the passage quoted from him by Augustine, does not prove it: in fact, if I remember rightly, he gives the contrary interpretation of it somewhere in his Poems. So in the same way Augustine brings forward a passage from Cyprian, on the Lord's Prayer: where it is clear that the blessed Martyr is not speaking of Rom. 7, but of Gal. 5. 17, between which two passages I have elsewhere shewn there is a wide difference.

Discuss. p. 250, &c. [vol. iii. Op. p. 743.]

lib. ii. cap. 3. cont. Jul. [§ 7. vol. x. part ii. p. 530.]

With regard to Ambrose, though he is of the same opinion as Augustine about St. Paul's meaning in ver. 15. and the following, still he gives us enough entirely to overthrow Augustine's interpretation. For he explains the words (ver. 14.) 'But I am carnal, sold under sin,' to mean a

wicked man. And so in his book on Isaac and the Soul, he says, "Where the soul is put for man, one must understand him as clinging to God and not to the body; as, 'blessed is every soul that is simple[u].' But where the flesh is put for man, a sinner is meant; as, 'I am carnal, sold under sin.'" But granting that these four writers agreed with Augustine on the interpretation of this chapter, yet what an array of Catholic doctors are we able to set against these few! Justin Martyr, Irenæus, Clement of Alexandria, Tertullian, Cyprian, Origen, Macarius, Basil the Great, Cyril, Chrysostom, the writer of the Commentaries attributed to Ambrose, St. Pacian and others, who all of them lived before Augustine. And with regard to Augustine, we can put him against himself, before he had become engaged in the heat of the Pelagian controversy: and we anxiously beseech the reader to compare his writings[x] on this passage when he followed the common opinion of the Fathers who had lived before him, with the interpretation which he sought after the rise of the Pelagian heresy, and the reasons which induced him to embrace it: as given by himself in his first book of Retractations. If the reader will do this, we have no doubt that he will greatly prefer Augustine before Pelagius, to Augustine against Pelagius. It was truly said by a great man that Augustine was accustomed to change his opinions, and that not always for the better. He once denied that it was possible for God to be seen with the eyes of a glorified body: afterwards he thought the reverse, and died in that opinion.

SECT. IX.

De Isaac et Anima. c. 2. [vol. i. p. 357.] [Prov. 11. 25; LXX. See Schleusner Lex. Gr. Vet. Test. in ἁπλοῦς.]

cap. 23. et 26, et lib. ii. 1.

§ 6. We must add here by the way, (as has also been observed by learned men,) that the interpretation of modern divines with whom Dr. Tully agrees, is most widely different from Augustine's sense and meaning. For that good which the Apostle says he willed but did not do, and that evil that he says he would not, but still did, this they interpret to mean actual good and evil: explaining the evil to be the very deed itself which is committed with the consent of the

[u] [Anima benedicta omnis simplex.]

[x] viz. quæst. 66. lib. LXXXIII. Quæstionum. [vol. vi. p. 44, &c.] et, in Quæst. expos. Epist. ad Rom. [vol. iii. p. 909, &c.] nec non Quæst. I. ad Simplicianum. [vol. vi. p. 81, &c.]

SECT. IX.

will from the concupiscence of the flesh, against the desire of the spirit: and the good, to be the very deed which a man wishes to do according to the spirit, but is prevented from actually doing it by the concupiscence of the flesh. On the other hand, Augustine plainly teaches that if this passage is to be explained as speaking of actual sins, it cannot be understood to speak of a regenerate person: and if it does, then we must necessarily understand it as speaking of the internal acts only of concupiscence, to which a man does not consent. Thus, in his treatise on Marriage and Concupiscence, he says: "The Apostle, however, goes on, and says, 'So then with the mind, I myself serve the law of God: but with the flesh, the law of sin;' which is to be understood as follows: 'With the mind I serve the law of God,' by not consenting to the law of sin; 'but with the flesh,' I serve 'the law of sin,' by having the desires of sin, from which, though I consent not to them, I am not yet altogether free." Again, against the two Epistles of the Pelagians; "And thence he concludes, 'So then with the mind, I myself serve the law of God: but with the flesh, the law of sin:' that is, with the flesh the law of sin, by concupiscence; but with the mind the law of God, by not consenting unto the same concupiscence." Again, against Julian: "Be unwilling, therefore, to do that which thou wishest not to suffer, and say not that we invite to pleasant deeds, you to whom we quote the Apostle, saying, 'For I know that in me (that is, in my flesh) dwelleth no good thing:' for although they do not the good which they would, not to desire, yet they go not after their desires, and that is to do good." And in the same way, every where throughout his writings. One might, therefore, without touching Augustine, condemn Dr. Tully's interpretation as absurd. And yet there have not been wanting very learned men, who, fully giving Augustine his due, have freely censured his interpretation.

cap. 31. [§ 36. vol. x. part ii. p. 297.]

lib. i. cap. 10. [ib. p. 421. § 21.]

ver. 5.

Thus the great Erasmus, on Rom. 7. 25. "It is true that Augustine contends against the two Epistles of the Pelagians, (I. 8. and some chapters following,) that the whole of this passage may be meant for St. Paul, either as a youth, or as under the law of sin, or as feeling under grace the motions

of the passions, though not assenting to them: but he strains many points so much, that it would do better to suppose St. Paul had taken upon him the character of the human race, in which there is the Gentile without the law, the carnal Jew under the law, and the spiritual freed through grace." And in truth, (to state the case as it really is,) what can be more strained and narrow than this interpretation, which applies such expressions of the Apostle as 'being carnal,' 'sold under sin,' 'doing evil,' 'unable to do what is good,' 'brought into captivity to the law of sin,' 'serving the law of sin,' to a man who is under grace, and feels the motions of his passions, but in no degree assents unto them? We should not, however, greatly oppose Dr. Tully and his friends, were they content with Augustine's interpretation, which, though absurd enough, still is by itself harmless: but they seem to have thought that his interpretation (to use Dr. Tully's own words) "did not particularly tend to the comfort of the faithful." Diss. p. 1.

§ 7. Let us now proceed to Dr. Tully's second assertion, or rather suspicion: namely, that after Pelagius, all the Fathers, especially the Latin, are on his side. But alas, how far is this assertion from the truth! For the Greek doctors, even after Augustine and Pelagius, adhered consistently to the primitive interpretation, as had been received and approved by the Catholic Church: in proof of this, Theodoret, Theophylact, Œcumenius, Damascene, and others, are sufficient witnesses. Indeed the writings of St. Augustine were either not so much known, or were not so much admired by these Greek Fathers: whereas in the Latin Church an excessive veneration for this great doctor (for we must confess the truth) drew away many from the more commonly received opinion of the earlier Fathers, both in this point and many others, and caused them to embrace opinions which were almost peculiar to himself. Neither is it true that all the Latin Fathers after Augustine, followed his teaching. We have already shewn that Ennodius and Sedulius are on our side. Primasius and Haimo, as Estius observes, unite both interpretations, Augustine's and the older one. Bede also is uncertain, and doubts which exposition he shall take. For on those words in Rom. 7. 'We

SECT. IX.

know that the law is spiritual,' he says: "Perchance, therefore, some other one is meant here: perhaps you are; either you are, or I am. If therefore it is some one of us, let us listen to him as if he were speaking of himself, and without anger let us correct ourselves. But if he himself is intended, let us not understand him, because he said, 'What I would, that I do not; but what I hate, that I do,' as if he wished to be chaste but was an adulterer, or wished to be merciful and was cruel, or wished to be holy and was unholy. But how then? I wish not to be concupiscent, and yet I am concupiscent." Of later writers, whom it is not the custom to esteem moderns, Lyranus and Carthusianus are, according to Estius, for our interpretation.

§ 8. It remains for us to say a few words on Dr. Tully's third and last assertion. He says that only one or two modern divines of any note favour our interpretation. But what of this, supposing it to be true? We certainly acknowledge that in the interpretation of Scripture the consent of the primitive Church is to be preferred to the opinion of all moderns, be they ever so numerous or learned: but this also is far from being true. For in support of our interpretation there are not only Faber Stapulensis, Erasmus, Isidorus Clarius, Zeger, Cardinal Toledo, and many other very learned divines in the Roman Church: but among the reformed, there are Castellio, Wolfgang Musculus, Bucer (who at least agrees with us thus far, as altogether to deny that St. Paul in Rom. 7. is speaking of himself), Grotius, Vossius, Amyraldus, and no few or unimportant ones in the reformed Gallican Church; and of our own divines, those men of blessed memory, the profound Jackson, the great Hammond, Bishop Taylor, a prelate of special genius, learning, and piety, Farindon, and very many great divines, who at the present day are an honour to the Church of England, and at the same time are duly honoured by her.

§ 9. What Dr. Tully says afterwards concerning the Catechism of Trent, has nothing to do with our present subject. We make but this one remark: that the old proverb applies here, 'the cover is worthy of the dish:' for in fact that interpretation of St. Paul's meaning excellently suits a catechism which, besides other dogmas quite opposed to

Christian piety, teaches[y] that true contrition for sin is not necessary for all: in fact that very few Christians can attain unto it, and so to supply this defect, God in His great indulgence has substituted the sacrament of Absolution, by which, forsooth, 'the common salvation of men may be obtained in an easier way.' SECT. IX.

§ 10. I must not however pass over his string of remarks on the judgment of our own holy Church, but I am compelled to say this much, by way of preface. Dr. Tully's audacity is hardly to be borne when we find him, as we do, setting up all his own dogmas for the decrees of the Church of England. We cannot think differently from him and from the interpretation of even one passage of Scripture, but we straightway speak against the voice of our Church. As if indeed so gentle a mother had thrust her sons into such a strait, that it was not open to them when investigating the meaning of the more difficult passages in Holy Writ, freely to enquire what was the opinion of the most ancient and approved divines of the Church, and to follow their consent. So far from this, she bids us do so: she has commanded it in her decrees, as we have already shewn. But Dr. Tully's sole object throughout his whole book is, that his opponent may be accounted (whether justly or not, it matters not) an enemy of the Church of England; for this end he has thought fit to distort the Articles, and pervert the Homilies. Would that he had first seriously reflected (to use his own words) how many great names this invidious attack must assail! We care not much for the Harmonist, indeed: but what becomes, if Dr. Tully prevails, of the divines whom we have just mentioned, those great lights and ornaments of our Church, with whom both in this and other points he agrees? Are they too to be rejected as spurious and disobedient children, drowning the voice of their mother? Should this ever happen, (which may God avert!) I know not how such a loss to the Church could be repaired, or where our beloved mother would find more true and worthy sons. But to come to the point. The argument by which he endeavours to prove that we contradict the Church of England in ex-

[y] Vid. Catechis. Trident. p. 11. ch. 5. de Pœnitentiâ n. 29—32. coll. n. 24—27.

SECT. IX. plaining this passage, is mainly this. There are these points to be observed in the ninth article: 1st. That original sin is the fault and corruption of the nature of every man that is naturally engendered of the offspring of Adam. 2ndly. By this corruption man is very far gone from original righteousness. 3rdly. That this same infection of nature doth remain in them that are regenerated. 4thly. That the Apostle, that is, Paul, doth confess this. 5thly. To prove this, a few words only from Gal. 5. 17, are quoted; but this is no matter; inasmuch as it is plain that this passage is of precisely the same meaning as that in Rom. 7. 19: so that at length we get this much from it, namely, that the Fathers of the Anglican Church were of opinion that the words of the Apostle in Rom. 7. from ver. 14, were most certainly to be understood as speaking of a regenerate person. Now the whole force of this fine argument depends on this: viz. that the passage in Gal. 5. 17, means precisely the same thing as that in Rom. 7. 19. But I have proved this not to be so in the Harmony, where it was clearly shewn that these passages agree in this one respect, namely, that each of them describes a certain struggle in the man: but that there is a vast difference between the kinds of struggle, whether we regard the persons, or the event of the struggle and contest. But what reply does Dr. Tully make to this? not a syllable. And is this the part of a fair and straightforward disputer? But Dr. Tully had needs take care lest this argument recoil upon himself. If the Fathers of our Church had believed that the Apostle in Rom. 7. must certainly be understood of a regenerate person, they surely would have quoted the passage before all others, to prove their conclusion, namely, that concupiscence doth remain even in the regenerate: since, if it be so understood, it is the most apposite of all in confirmation of such a position: but they evidently do no such thing: for omitting this passage, they make use of the other from the Galatians, which all explain as speaking of a man under the grace of the Gospel. And now I think sufficient answer has been made to every thing Dr. Tully has brought forward, whether from the Fathers or the Articles of the Church of England, against our interpretation of the seventh chapter of the Romans: and I appeal to the fair-minded reader, whether I

Gal. 5. 17.

II. Diss. ix. 23—25. p. 113—116.

may not with justice return Dr. Tully his own words: "And now I think it is clear enough how dangerous it is for any one in an important matter to celebrate his victory before he has levied together and reviewed his forces." SECT. IX. Diss. p. 9.

§ 11. After producing these authorities, Dr. Tully at length proceeds to the consideration of the passage itself. It would be enough for my purpose to pass over all that he says upon it, and to refer the reader to the Harmony, II. Diss. ix. For I am sure, if any one will read that chapter attentively and impartially, and compare it with what Dr. Tully has brought against it in his own Dissertation, he will easily see that he by no means brings satisfactory answers to my arguments: and that my refutation of the arguments of the opposite party remains untouched and unshaken. But lest I should seem to avoid the question, I will not hesitate briefly to run over the several objections brought against me.

In the Harmony, my arguments against that interpretation which Dr. Tully upholds, are as follow: "In the first place, it (i. e. this interpretation) supposes that the Apostle here introduces observations unimportant, and perfectly foreign to his design. For it is most clear that at the beginning of the chapter he speaks of the inefficacy of the law in freeing men from the dominion of sin, and, moreover, shews that so far from doing that, it even irritated and increased the force of sinful desire. From this doctrine, and this only, arose the objections which the Apostle discusses in the seventh and thirteenth verses. But it is altogether absurd and impossible that the Apostle should answer objections arising from the inefficacy of the law in those who have not the grace of the Gospel, by a representation of his own state under the Gospel." To this, Dr. Tully, after again attacking the Harmonist about his youth in a very uncourteous and angry manner, makes the following reply. "How, I ask, could the Apostle more effectually invite to the grace and righteousness of the Gospel, men who were mad for works, though wanting in all true piety, than by his own example, who having been once under the law, could not do any good, until he was admitted by faith to the grace of the Gospel?" It is indeed marvellous how such an answer could come from a learned man, which so far from solving the argument, II. Diss. ix. § 8. p. 99. Diss. p. 10. ἐργομανοῦντας.

SECT. IX. has not even any thing to do with it. Besides, there is an untrue assertion in it: namely, that the Apostle in the fourteenth and following verses is describing the state of a man, who, through the grace of the Gospel, had arrived at that which by the law he had not been able to do, namely, to shake off the yoke of sin, and break through its dominion. For on the contrary, these verses clearly describe the state of a man still carnal, and sold under sin, who, very far from being able to do what is right, is led captive by the law of sin, and serves it. Dr. Tully's next remark is of the same stamp. "What he adds touching the state of his warfare against the flesh, though with the sure hope of victory, is a greater inducement for him strenuously to undergo the struggle, since what the ineffectual rigour of the law could not do, the most effectual grace of the Gospel can." Now in the first place, the Apostle's argument in the fourteenth and following verses is not only joined to the former verses, as being in some way connected with them, but it is a direct answer to the objection contained in the thirteenth verse. The objection there made is, that it is a wonderful thing that that law which is of itself holy, just, and good, should be made the cause of death to those who are under it. I again ask, How do the verses following get rid of this objection, if the Apostle is there speaking of his own regeneration: since in a state of regeneration he is no longer under the dispensation of the law, and has nothing to do with it; much less is the law the cause of death to him, or capable of being so? We may in vain wait for Dr. Tully's answer to this question. 2ndly. I know not with what semblance, even, of truth, Dr. Tully could say that in the fourteenth and following verses man's struggle with the flesh, joined with a sure hope of victory, is described. For on the contrary, a contest is there plainly depicted, from which nothing could be expected but that he must be overcome by the flesh, and be led captive to sin: and is this a great inducement for strenuously undergoing the struggle?

II. Diss. ix. 8. p. 100. § 12. In the same section I had most clearly proved by another argument that Dr. Tully's interpretation was entirely foreign to the design and purpose of the Apostle, as follows: "In the next place, since all allow that the Apostle, from

the seventh verse to the fourteenth, is speaking of the state of a man who is under the law, what sufficient reason can be imagined that we should suppose he changes his design in the fourteenth and fifteenth verses? especially as the words of the fourteenth verse contain evidently the reason of what had gone before, as appears by the causative particle *for*, which connects it with the preceding verses." To this Dr. Tully replies (with his usual measure of irony by way of introduction,) "What can be plainer than that the Apostle's only or at least chief object in the whole of his argument, from the beginning of the Epistle to the end of the seventh chapter, is to lead sinners from themselves to Christ, from their own righteousness of works, to that which is in Christ by faith? And to make this clearer, he shews, 1st, that such was the rigour of the law, that it admitted of no works for salvation, on which there was the very least taint of sin: and therefore to hope for life by the law was useless. And 2ndly, that that deadly power of the law (i. e. of which he had been speaking) came not from its own nature, but from the inherent sin of all men, &c. But since this is born in all, and dwells equally in Paul the regenerate as in Paul the persecuter of Christ, (though through the grace of Christ its dominion is not so powerful in believers,) why, I ask, should it be thought irrelevant for St. Paul to prove the same thing by different 'middle terms,' of which the one is himself as yet unregenerate, the other himself when regenerate?" But what is all this but to bewilder his reader with perplexities, and draw him off from the subject itself? Our argument is as follows: The causative particle *for*, in the fourteenth verse, plainly shews its connection with the preceding verses: this connection shews the same subject is here treated of as before: and that the pronoun *I* must signify the same person as it did in the former verses. Now all agree that the Apostle was before speaking of a man under the law, and that the pronoun *I* stood for a man under the law: therefore in this verse also, where the cause is given of what had been said above, he is speaking of a man under the law: otherwise the whole were but so many loose sticks. And so a very learned divine has used this argument, though in different words. And now I ask what has Dr. Tully done

SECT. IX.

Diss. p. 11.

SECT. IX. towards solving the objection? But that the whole matter may be clearer, let us now take the following paraphrase of the thirteenth and fourteenth verses, accommodated to their supposition who are of opinion that the Apostle begins in the fourteenth verse to speak of himself as regenerate.

TEXT.	PARAPHRASE.
Ver. 13. *Was then that which is good made death unto me? God forbid. But sin, that it might appear sin, working death in me by that which is good: that sin by the commandment might become exceeding sinful.*	Was then a good law the cause of death to me (who was instructed indeed by the knowledge of the law, but not yet regenerated by the grace of the Gospel?) God forbid! but sin and vicious lusts in me being more inflamed and irritated by occasion of the good law, (as I said in verse 8,) were strictly and properly the cause of that death, that hence might appear the nature of sin, and what a wicked thing (so to speak) sin actually is, which could convert the best gift of God to my destruction.

TEXT.	PARAPHRASE.
Ver. 14. *For we know that the law is spiritual: but I am carnal, sold under sin.*	Still more clearly to explain the matter, there is a great difference between my nature and that of the law. For the law coming from God the Spirit of purity, enjoins a spiritual manner of life. But I (that is, I Paul, now converted to the faith of the Gospel, gifted with the Spirit of Christ, and so brought to the highest pitch of Christian virtue) am of a carnal disposition, repugnant to the spiritual law, and enslaved by vile affections. Hence the miserable necessity is laid upon me of transgressing the law, and of suffering the death imposed upon its transgressors: so that death clearly becomes my portion by means of the law, yet in nowise through the fault of the law, but on account of my own corrupt disposition.

Now every one must see that the parenthesis in the para-

phrase of the fourteenth verse, which must be inserted according to Dr. Tully's hypothesis, causes the divine discourse of the Apostle to become vapid, unconnected, and absurd. But if it be left out, and the pronoun *I* in the fourteenth verse be understood to mean the same person as it did in the thirteenth and former verses, (which we contend must be done,) then the Apostle's argument is clear, perspicuous, and consistent. If however Dr. Tully complains that we have unfairly attributed this inconsistent paraphrase to him, we entreat him to bring forward another which is neither at variance with the words and design of the Apostle, nor with his own hypothesis: and if he can, we will at once yield the day. SECT. IX.

§ 13. Dr. Tully proceeds: "I do not see," he says, "why our friend the Harmonist should consider such a transition from one state to another so absurd, unless he is willing to condemn himself as guilty of the same absurdity, by applying the former part of the twenty-fifth verse of this chapter to Paul regenerate, which is equally absurd." I answer: The Apostle Paul, after a long description in the preceding verses of the miserable state of man under the law and destitute of evangelical grace, celebrates in the beginning of ver. 25. in a short parenthesis, the grace of God in Christ, by which alone both he himself had been freed from that deplorable condition, and a way of deliverance from it was made and opened to others: and then he returns to his former subject. I leave it to others to decide whether this parenthesis of mine, which however is not my own, but which the ancient doctors attribute with one consent to the Apostle, is as absurd as that paraphrase of Dr. Tully's: but more on this subject hereafter. Diss. p. 12.

§ 14. Dr. Tully proceeds: "What sort of connection," he says, "will he find in the verse immediately following, 'There is therefore now no condemnation to them which are in Christ Jesus,' when according to him no mention of such persons occurs in the whole of the preceding chapter, excepting in this short sentence in the last verse, 'I thank God,' &c.? But when he rests his objection on the causative particle *for*, what does he do with these words in ch. 8. 1. 'There is therefore now no condemnation?' Now therefore! why Diss. p. 13. Rom. 8. 1.

SECT. IX.

so? Whence is this inference?" &c. What a fog the reverend gentleman raises in a clear sky! Please, reader, to refer to the analysis of the seventh chapter of the Romans in our Harmony, where I have clearly explained the connection of the Apostle's argument in the whole of the seventh chapter, and also of the eighth chapter with the seventh. The sum of this analysis is as follows: 1st. The Apostle teaches in the four first verses of the seventh chapter, that the Jews who had embraced the faith of Christ, were no longer bound by the law given through Moses; but were just as free from that obligation as a woman is free from the bond of matrimony on the death of her husband. 2ndly, That the Jews might understand what an immense blessing this was, St. Paul, in the fifth verse, shews how wretched was the state of those under the law. And on the other hand, in the sixth verse, the blessed condition of those who were delivered from the bond of the law through Christ: so that Dr. Tully's assertion is plainly false in which he confidently states that according to our interpretation, there is no mention of regenerate persons in chapter the seventh, except in the last verse. For we acknowledge and even contend that the Apostle is speaking of regenerate persons from the beginning of the chapter to the seventh verse. 3rdly, The Apostle, not content with saying that the law did not avail for destroying the corrupt affections of men, draws the contrary conclusion, as is his custom, by assuming that not only was it of no use for taking away evil desires, but it accidentally served to excite and inflame them: and lest this should appear offensive to the Jews, and give occasion for cavilling, as if the Apostle were teaching that the law was the cause of sin, and therefore that it was bad, he prudently anticipates this objection in the seventh verse, and refutes it in those following. 4thly, The Apostle dwells upon solving this objection, and another springing from it, in the thirteenth verse, up to the end of the chapter; what can be plainer than this? 5thly. Lastly, he repeats in the beginning of the eighth chapter, what he had said in the first six verses of the seventh chapter, (from whence he had evidently made a digression, in order to answer these objections,) namely, that

II. Diss. ix. 4, 5, 6, pp. 97—99.

both the chain of the Mosaic law was loosed, and that no one would be condemned for not observing its ceremonies who should tread the path of that spiritual life marked out in the Gospel, (verse the first,) and also that all true Christians were delivered through the Gospel from that dominion of sin from which there was no hope or possibility of deliverance through the Mosaic law (verses 2, 3, 4, &c.) If Dr. Tully knows of a clearer analysis of the Apostle's discourse than this, I wish he would produce it, and if not, that he would not disdain to use this one with me. Meanwhile it is quite clear to an observant reader how hasty the Doctor must have been when he closed his remarks, on the connection of St. Paul's discourse, with this piece of irony, as if in triumph, and laughing over a vanquished enemy: "And now let the Harmonist consider whither his hastiness has brought him." SECT. IX.

§ 15. In my ninth section, I have met an objection brought forward by opponents in the following manner. "The usual objection of the change of tense in the fourteenth verse is so trifling, that it is strange serious men should have ever used it. For what is it? Because the Apostle changes from the past tense to the present, must he therefore be supposed to change the original design of his argument for one totally foreign to it? Who is ignorant that this change of tenses is extremely common in all writers, even in the same context: and especially, when the subject they are speaking of remains the same as it was?" II. Diss. ix. 9. 100, 101.

To this Dr. Tully replies, "Humph! Are we then to think it strange to separate the present tense from the past, when the subject itself particularly requires it?" I answer: By no means. But this I say, that it does not become serious-minded men, merely on account of a change in the tenses, to attribute to the Apostle a subject totally foreign to his design, and therefore most inconsistent and absurd. Diss. p. 14.

Dr. Tully proceeds: "Let him even shew a shadow of reason why St. Paul should pass from the past to the present tense, when it in no way assists his object. For if he is going on speaking of himself as unregenerate, what necessity was there for him to change the tense?" I answer: I have shewn more than a shadow of reason why St. Paul, though

SECT. IX.

still speaking of the same unregenerate person, should pass from the past to the present tense: I beg the reader to listen to my own words, not as they are miserably cropped and mutilated by Dr. Tully in his usual way, but as they stand in the book itself.

"But what if the reason for this change appear plainly from the passage itself? For the Apostle in the ninth verse had considered man as here represented, in that state in which he was before he received the law. Then in the following verses to the fourteenth, he shews the event, that is, what had happened to him in consequence of having received the law, namely, that by the law he became guilty of a greater offence, and subject to a severer punishment. So far then it was requisite that the Apostle should use the past tense. But at the fourteenth verse he shews the reason why the consequences of the law were different from what it had intended. The nature of the law, he says, is different from that of the men who are under the law, &c. Now it would have been improper that the Apostle, explaining a case even then existing, should speak in the past time, or say, 'The law was spiritual, but I was carnal.' How much more fit was it to use the present:—'The law is spiritual, but I am carnal,' as will readily appear to every one who attentively considers the matter." To this Dr. Tully replies: "As far as regards the former clause of the sentence, it would not become St. Paul to speak unmeaningly, since the law not only was, but is always spiritual. No one but a trifler could say, I 'was' a man, yet it was very fitting for St. Paul to say I 'am' carnal, because, in a manner, and in a certain sense, he always was such."

Diss. p. 14, 15.

Dr. Tully therefore acknowledges the reason to be self-evident, why St. Paul, when speaking of the law, should use the present tense, and that he could not have spoken otherwise with any meaning. But in his reply concerning the latter clause of the sentence, how miserably (begging his pardon) does he himself trifle! In truth the question here is not in what sense St. Paul called the person there described 'carnal,' (that comes on afterwards,) but why the Apostle should have changed the tense in both clauses, and now speaks in the present. The reason, we assert, is evident; it

SECT. IX.

was not proper that the Apostle, when explaining an existing case, should use the past tense: on the contrary, it was actually necessary for him to speak in the present. For this sole reason we contend that St. Paul said, not that the law 'was,' but 'is' spiritual, and for the same reason, not that I 'was,' but that I 'am' carnal, and so likewise in the following verses. What has Dr. Tully alleged to invalidate this reason? Nothing whatever.

§ 16. In the tenth section of the same chapter, I have refuted, by means of another argument, their opinion who interpret this chapter of the Romans from ver. 14, of St. Paul himself in his regenerate state, and I have shewn that this opinion makes the Apostle's reasoning unconnected and contradictory to itself. This general view I have illustrated and confirmed by many instances, of which the first is as follows: "Of the man here described it is said, 'I am carnal.' But of the regenerated, 'he walks not after the flesh but after the Spirit.'" To this Dr. Tully answers: "As if," he says, "'to be carnal,' (or as the Apostle means, to have a carnal nature,) and 'to walk after the flesh' were equivalents, which are things far and far asunder. Another begging of the question! The Apostle by no means walked after the flesh; and yet he said with truth, 'I am carnal.' I will shew how, if the necessary distinction be kept in mind, this is quite plain. For a man is said to be carnal, viewed either according to the Law or the Gospel: according to the former, the holiest man on earth will be carnal, because whatever the grace of holiness may effect, he does not in any way come up to the spirituality of the law, (so to speak,) which abominates all sin and calls it flesh." To which I reply, 1st, 'To be carnal,' and 'to walk after the flesh,' are indeed different expressions: but only so far as this, that the former signifies, if I may so say, the habit of carnality, the latter has more reference to carnal actions and deeds. But whoever is carnal, walks after the flesh, and vice versa. 2ndly, It is very easy for the Doctor to coin minute distinctions whenever he pleases, which may appear quite clear to himself, and which are actually necessary for supporting his own hypothesis. But I contend that Scripture phrases must be explained by Scripture, and not according to his fancy or use of them:

p. 101.

ver. 14.

Rom. 8. 1.

Iterum τὸ ἐν ἀρχῇ

SECT. IX.

and therefore I ask, where is a truly religious man, not to say most holy, such as St. Paul was, described in the Holy Scriptures as 'carnal,' with respect to his affections? Many of the Corinthians indeed are called carnal by St. Paul by reason of their imperfect knowledge, and because they were unskilled in the knowledge of the mysteries of the Gospel, (which sense of the word is foreign to the present subject,) and many of them also on account of the carnal affections predominating in them: as indeed there always have been, and always will be too many, under the very law of the spirit of life, who serve the flesh. Such do those of the Corinthians appear to have been, who are rebuked by the Apostle in the third verse of the above-mentioned chapter. "For whereas," he says, "there is among you envying and strife, and divisions, are ye not carnal, and walk as men?" 'Strifes, envyings, divisions,' the Apostle elsewhere enumerates amongst the works of the flesh which of a certainty exclude a man from the kingdom of heaven, and therefore the proof in this place is from the effects. For since emulations, contention, schism, are fruits of the flesh, it is certain that wherever they are seen, there their root must be flourishing. These sins prevailed amongst many of the Corinthians: hence the Apostle convinces them of being carnal. There were also some among the Corinthians, who, on account of other works of the flesh, might most justly be called carnal: as those, for instance, who were addicted to drunkenness, and that too at the Holy Communion, and to fornication and other dreadful impurities. But granting that some truly religious Corinthians, who were as yet but beginners in religion, were called carnal by St. Paul, by reason of their affections, yet we still have to search for a passage of Scripture where the word 'carnal' is received in such a sense as to apply to St. Paul himself, a man of wonderful holiness, who had rebuked the Corinthians for the very reason that they were carnal. Dr. Tully contends that from the text itself it is clear that the word must be taken in this sense, for he argues as follows from the Apostle's words, 'The law is spiritual, but I am carnal:' "This carnality which he here speaks of, is plainly opposed to the spirituality, or in common language, the perfection of

1 Cor. 3. 1.

Gal. 5. 20.

1 Cor. 11. 21.

2 Cor. 12. 20, 21.

the law. And who is there, I ask, that will dare to profess himself to be free from it while he is on earth? When he looks on that law so awful from its purity, who will not exclaim with the holy Apostle, 'I am carnal?'" But here again Dr. Tully, with no text of Scripture and no authority of any ancient ecclesiastical writer to back him up, puts a new interpretation on the word 'spiritual' according to his own fancy, as he also gives a meaning warranted by no example to the word 'carnal.' For who has ever found that word, used by any author of sufficient authority, to mean the 'rigour' of the law? doubtless the law is here called spiritual because it commands a spiritual manner of life, and requires that we should walk after the Spirit, mortifying and crucifying the desires and affections of the flesh: and hence the spiritual law is opposed to carnal man, that is, to man given up to the desires of the flesh. Which opposition is presently explained more clearly by St. Paul, in these words: "Because the carnal mind is enmity against God, for it is not subject to the law of God, neither indeed can be." Every one must see that the passages are equivalent: for as here, 'the carnal mind,' so in the passage under review, 'the carnal man,' so called on account of the desire of the flesh, is altogether opposed to the law of God. And to shew the exact agreement of the passages, as what is said in Rom. 8. 7, namely, that 'the carnal mind is enmity against God and cannot be subject to the law of God,' is added as a reason for what had just gone before in verse 6, namely, 'to be carnally minded is death,' so these words in Rom. 7. 14, 'the law is spiritual but I am carnal,' are joined on to the thirteenth verse as the reason for what had been said there, 'that a good law had been made death' or 'had worked death by sin.' In both places the Apostle's meaning is clearly the same: namely, that the majority of men incur the death threatened by the law, not from the fault of the law, but from their own sin, because they are carnal, and of that disposition which is most repugnant to a spiritual law, and which is unable to be subject to it. What can be plainer than this? and therefore from this opposition between the spiritual law and carnal man, we gain this irrefragable argument against our opponents. The person of whom the Apostle is speaking in

SECT. IX.

πνευματικὸς

σαρκικὸς

ἀκρίβεια

Rom. 8. 7.

SECT. IX.

Rom. 7. 14. is called 'carnal' because he is of that disposition which is plainly repugnant to that spiritual manner of life which the law enjoins, and which is unable to be subject to the law of God which commands such a life: whence he is said to have slain himself; but this does not apply to a regenerate or truly religious man: therefore the Apostle is not speaking in this verse of a regenerate or truly religious person.

§ 17. In the same section I have drawn the following argument from ver. 14: the person there described is said to be 'sold unto sin,' a metaphor taken from those who are sold and entirely delivered up to the power of some master, and plainly the same expression as is used of Ahab, who is described as being the worst of men, as well as kings, in which passage the Septuagint version has 'he was sold to work wickedness.' But of the regenerate it is said, that 'being made free from sin, he became the servant of righteousness.' Dr. Tully's answer to this is, that "we must by all means distinguish between a voluntary slave, and one compelled to be a slave: that it is one thing to be sold unto sin, another to sell oneself." A most unhappy way of getting out of the difficulty: as if indeed any one could become the servant of sin against his own will. For surely as there is no sin that is not voluntary, so no one can become the slave of sin except voluntarily: no one is sold unto sin who has not sold himself. Damascene, in treating of this passage, beautifully explains the point. "The suggestion of the evil one, that is, the law of sin, entering the members of our flesh, makes its attacks upon us through the flesh. For having once willingly transgressed the law of God, and admitting the suggestion of the devil, we give him an opening, and are sold by ourselves unto sin: and so our body is easily led into it."

1 Kings 21. 20.

ἐπράθη ποίησειν τὸ πονηρόν

Rom. 6. 18.

De Fid. Orthod. lib. iv. cap. 22. [vol. i. p. 292.]

In the same way, St. Basil: "He who is drawn into sin against his will ought to consider that he is overcome by some other sin already existing in him: and that willingly serving that, he is afterwards led on by it to those which he would not." To prove his rule, St. Basil quotes directly the words of the Apostle. "For we know that the law is spiritual, but I am carnal, sold under sin." Therefore it is in vain for Dr. Tully so seriously to warn his reader of

Mor. Reg. 23. vol. ii. p. 433. edit. Paris 1637. [vol. ii. p. 255.]

Rom. 7. 14.

SECT. IX.

the discrepancy between the Septuagint and Hebrew text, in the passage quoted above, and to accuse me of unfairness in quoting it, as he does in the following way: "It is wonderful," he says, "that the 'Dissertator' should so use the passage, (though some few others have done so,) for although the Septuagint version is, 'he was sold,' ἐπράθη yet whoever will look to the Hebrew word, he will see התמכרך that it agrees with our English version, 'he sold himself,' which circumstance ought not to have been passed over by one desirous of truth: for such a course savours rather of a desire for victory in the dark than for Divine truth." But however he may despise the youthful Harmonist, I should have thought that the version of the seventy interpreters, with two others besides them, who certainly had not studied the Hebrew original carelessly, might have had some weight with him. But what is he contending for? really nothing! for as I have said before, 'to be sold to sin,' and 'to sell oneself,' come to one and the same thing. If, however, Dr. Tully had enquired where the expression 'sold unto sin,' (taken passively,) was used in our sense, he might have been referred to the first book of Maccabees, 1. 15. where the writer thus speaks of certain most wicked Jews. "And made themselves uncircumcised, and forsook the holy covenant, and joined themselves to the heathen, and 'were sold to do mischief.'" It matters not, that the book is apocryphal: since in a question concerning the genuine sense of an expression in use among the Hebrews, no one in his senses will deny that a Hebrew author, writing in Hebrew, (as Jerome bears witness,) an ancient one, and much esteemed in the ancient Christian Church, and even allowed a place in the sacred canon itself, by many of the ancients, no one, I say, will deny that such an one ought to be reckoned a competent judge. Now from this passage, compared with that in 1 Kings 21. 20, it appears that the ancient Jews were in the habit of designating a very profligate sinner, by this, as it were, proverbial expression, 'he was sold unto sin,' or 'sold himself.' Who therefore will believe (excepting those who are ready to believe whatever they wish) that the Apostle Paul, a Jew, and using on all occasions Jewish expressions, should have used this phrase in a discourse directed to

1 Kings 21. 20. p. 16.

SECT. IX. Jews, (ver. 1,) in such a sense as that it might be applied to a regenerate and truly religious, and even a very holy person? Surely with justice may we say, in Dr. Tully's own words,
Diss. p. 30. "Let us search the Scriptures, and beware, lest we be found rebellious against the light."

§ 18. It will be seen what irrefragable arguments have been deduced from this fourteenth verse, in support of our opinion: we will add, however, to these, the following fact: that even Calvin, and Beza after him, with many other reformed divines who adopted Calvin's teaching, although they agree with Dr. Tully in the interpretation of the following verses, are yet forced to acknowledge, from the case being so evident, that the whole of the fourteenth verse must be interpreted of an unregenerate person, and therefore that the Apostle begins to speak of himself as regenerate, in the fifteenth verse. Calvin's remarks on the passage are as follow: "Now," he says, "he begins to contrast in a greater degree the law and man's nature, that it may be more clearly seen whence arises the fault of death. And afterwards, he brings forward the example of a regenerate person." And again. "He gives a bare comparison between nature and the law: since there is no greater difference in human things, than that of the spirit and the flesh. The law is spiritual: man is carnal. What argument therefore can there be between man's nature and the law? between light and darkness." And again, "Men in their natural state, and as long as they retain their natural dispositions, are called carnal, for inasmuch as they are vicious so they have no thoughts or aspirations but what are gross and earthly." Lastly, he thus explains the words, 'sold under sin.' "This particle shews what the flesh can do by itself. For man by nature is no less the slave of sin than are purchased slaves, who are used by their masters as they will, just as they do their very beasts. The notion of compulsion must be always excepted: we sin voluntarily, nor would it be sin were it not voluntary. Wherefore the above simile must not be taken to favour the idea of a compulsory servitude, but of willing submission." What can be plainer than this, against the Doctor's trifling distinction between the voluntary and the forced slave of sin?

SECT. IX.

But on ver. 15. Calvin thus comments: "He now proceeds to the more particular example of man in his regenerate state," &c. In the same way Beza, in his notes on the passage: "The cause of this is because the law demands a heavenly purity: but men, such as they are born, are the slaves of corruption, which they voluntarily serve." And so on the fifteenth verse: "From the seventh to the fifteenth verse he is shewing the use of the law in the unregenerate." Aretius (not to mention others who have followed Calvin) interprets the passage in the same way, explaining the Apostle's words 'sold under sin,' by 'being in its absolute possession.' Whatever reasons however induced them to interpret the fourteenth verse of an unregenerate person, they surely were bound by the same reasons to do so in the following verses. They were obliged, in fact, to acknowledge that the Apostle is not speaking of a regenerate person in the fourteenth verse, first, because the words of that verse are connected with the preceding one, and evidently contain the cause of what is said there: and it is quite plain that the Apostle is not speaking there of a regenerate person: and secondly because such expressions as 'to be carnal,' and 'sold under sin,' cannot in any way be applied in their Scriptural meaning to a regenerate person. How is it then that they did not see that the same arguments prove that the following verses must not be interpreted of a regenerate person? For the first words of the fifteenth verse are evidently connected with the fourteenth, by the causative particle 'for.' And then, do not such expressions as are used of the person described in the following verses, namely, that 'with the flesh he serves the law of sin,' and that 'he is led captive to the law of sin,' mean the same thing as 'being carnal' and 'sold under sin?' It is also to be observed that Dr. Tully's argument, in support of his opinion, drawn from the change of the past into the present tense, and which he sets such high value upon as to pronounce "that it would of itself not only press hard upon, but overwhelm his opponents," goes for nothing even in the judgment of Calvin, Beza, and other reformed divines. For this change of tense first occurs in the fourteenth verse, which verse, these divines contend, is not to be interpreted of a regenerate person.

illius plenum mancipium

ver. 25.

ver. 23.

Diss. p. 14.

SECT. IX.

§ 19. In the twelfth section I have discussed the arguments brought forward by Paræus, in support of the opposite opinion, in his explanation of the seventh chapter of the Romans, the first of which is, "It is evident that the Apostle is speaking of himself and not of another, because he continues to lament over his own state, using the first person through all the twelve verses, 'I am carnal,'" &c. I answer: Every one in any degree acquainted with St. Paul's Epistles, must be aware that this change of person is a very favourite way of his expressing in his own person the state or circumstances of others. In proof of which the following passages are referred to; 1 Cor. 4. 3, 4; compared with verse 6; Rom. 3. 7; 1 Cor. 6. 12, 15, and 10. 23, 29, 30; Gal. 2. 18.

μετασχηματισμὸν

Dr. Tully, with some rhetorical effusions as usual, by way of preface, answers this in the following manner. "Let the reader consider, and remember what an office he has taken upon himself, namely, to prove the assertion 'that St. Paul in other passages speaks of himself in the first person, in a way which is very far from applying to a holy man.' This is the task he has undertaken. Let us therefore look to the passages, and every one will see how well they answer this description." But I am not aware what right Dr. Tully has for imposing tasks on the Harmonist at pleasure. For where, I ask, are these words to be found, which Dr. Tully takes care to print in italics as the Harmonist's very own, "that St. Paul in other passages speaks of himself in the first person, in a way which by no means applies to a holy man?" My words are, "that this change of person is a very favourite way of the Apostle's of expressing in his own person the state or circumstances of others." And do not the passages I have quoted prove this? Why, Dr. Tully himself allows it! It is quite certain, besides, that in one of these passages St. Paul speaks of himself in the first person in a way very far from applying to a holy man. For in Rom. 3. 7. he says: "For if the truth of God hath more abounded through my lie unto His glory, why yet am I also judged as a sinner?" He calls the 'infidelity' or incredulity of the Jews a lie, of which he had spoken in the third verse; and he made use of the word 'lie,' on account (as Estius rightly observes) of its opposition to the 'truth' of God. 'To abound in glory,' is 'to become

Diss. p. 18.

more conspicuous.' The meaning of the whole passage is, If the truth of God has become more conspicuous and glorious (namely, in the calling of the Gentiles) through my incredulity who am an unbelieving Jew, by what right shall this incredulity of mine be punished by God? consequently the Apostle, as in the seventh chapter so here, is sustaining the character of the Jews, and speaks of himself in the first person, in a way which is far from applying to a holy man. For he speaks of the infidelity of the Jews in his own person, from which sin he himself nevertheless was most clear. Dr. Tully, by not attending to the design of the passage and the context, seems to have thought that the word 'lie' was to be taken here in its strict and proper meaning, namely, a deliberate declaration of what is untrue, and that St. Paul's opponents had falsely accused him of such a lie. A mere dream!

SECT. IX.

§ 10. In the next section, to the objection brought forward by Paræus, that "a change of persons is found in Scripture, and that in any passage where it occurs its meaning is always plain from the context, but that here it is by no means so," I have replied as follows: "Surely if it is plain in any passage, it is doubly plain here. For not to mention the arguments already brought forward which actually require this figure, the Apostle when wishing to answer the objection that the law is the cause of sin, and so to shew that so far from being the cause, it alone accurately and fairly laid open the nature of sin; he says 'that he should not have known sin, but by the law,' and 'that once when he was without the law he did not know it:' surely this 'being without the law,' denotes in the Apostle's writings the state and condition of Gentiles or of those who are without a written law, as it is opposed to those who live under the dispensation of a law. For to live 'without law,' and to live 'lawlessly,' or 'lawless,' mean the same thing. Now the Apostle surely was never without a law: inasmuch as he was a Jew by birth, a disciple of Gamaliel from his childhood, and one who had imbibed the teaching of the law with his mother's milk. It is necessary therefore for us to suppose that the Apostle wished to represent in his own person the state of the Jews: in the first place, such as

p. 103.

χωρὶς νόμου

ἄνομον ἀνόμως see Rom. 2. 12. 1 Cor. 9. 20, 21.

SECT. IX. they were, 'without the law,' i. e. 'before the law was given them:' and then as they were 'when the commandment came, after the law was given.' And if he began his argument with this change of person, what reason is there to induce us to believe that he did not continue it in the following verses?" I have quoted the entire paragraph that the reader might the more clearly see how Dr. Tully "backs out" of the matter. For what is his answer to it?

Diss. p. 19. "I confess," he says, "that the passage is difficult, and one which allows the curious plenty of room for the exercise of their intellect: every one is welcome, as far as I am concerned, to his own interpretation of it, so that he does not deny that St. Paul is speaking concerning himself: for there is no necessity for doing this." This is just as much as saying, I confess I am not able to give any certain answer to this argument, but I never will acknowledge that St. Paul is not here speaking of himself. A great man has truly said, 'that no slavery is so miserable as that of being a slave to an opinion.' Dr. Tully however has made the difficulty of this passage his screen, that he might escape unseen in the darkness of which he himself was the cause. The noon-day sun is darkness to him who shuts his eyes and will not see it: and so and in no other way is this passage obscure. Is it difficult to see what St. Paul means by 'without the law?' It is clear from the passages already noted, that he constantly expresses by this phrase their condition who are without a written law. Is it difficult to find out whether St. Paul himself was ever without a written law? Least of all men, for he was born under the law, and imbibed its teaching with his mother's milk. What then follows, but that the Apostle is not speaking in this passage of himself, but of another; which was to be proved. Dr. Tully however presently takes courage, and attempts to explain this difficult passage in the following manner: "I indeed agree to their opinion, who do not understand by the passage a law in its primary meaning, but in a relative sense, namely, one but little efficacious to the conscience of the unregenerate, and not comprehended in its due spiritual and intimate meaning: which is the same case in effect as if there were no law: not that there is actually no law, but because it does not exercise its power, as if it really

δουλεύοντος τῇ ὑποθέσει

κατά τι

did not exist." To pass over the gross solecism in these words, (caused, as I suppose, by their having been written in too great haste,) I cannot help regretting the total want of straightforwardness in the Doctor. He here brings forward the very answer of Paræus, which he must know I had completely refuted in the Harmony, which passage I beg the careful reader to examine, and judge for himself. Dr. Tully therefore, not trusting in this interpretation, again advises his reader to dismiss our argument as of no value, and to hold unflinchingly to the conclusion that St. Paul is here speaking of himself. For he thus closes his answer: "As far as our present purpose is concerned, there does not seem any great necessity to trouble ourselves much about the meaning of the passage, so long as we firmly hold that St. Paul is speaking of himself." What use therefore is it to argue with an opponent so bound down to an opinion? he must have the pleasure of keeping to his own judgment.

II. Diss. ix. 14. p. 103, 104.

§ 21. Dr. Tully's answers to my objections against Paræus, concerning the expressions of the Apostle, 'the good that I would,' and 'the evil that I would not,' are so frivolous, that it is hardly worth while to detain the reader by a consideration of them: begging him however just to compare what I have said with the answer made to it, it will be sufficient briefly to notice one or two points. 1. Dr. Tully denies that the will, however perfect, earnest, or firm, necessarily produces action: but, on the contrary, says that daily experience refutes such a notion. After so many theological paradoxes, what a monstrous piece of philosophy have we here! For if we regard the actions which are in our own power (of which alone there can be any question, since in those not in our own power it is not reckoned a fault not to perform what we wish) nothing in philosophy is more certain than that a "perfect and firm will necessarily produces action." For the will governs the powers of the whole man: so that whatever we are able to do, and wish to do with a perfect and firm will, that of necessity we really do. It is useless to bring forward the case of St. Peter. When St. Peter denied Christ, he did not wish with a perfect will not to deny Him, for if he had, he certainly would never have done so: but

Diss. II. ix. 15, 16. p. 105-107.

ἐφ' ἡμῖν

SECT. IX.

more of this hereafter. 2ndly. Dr. Tully professes to disagree with what I said concerning the volition of good, which St. Paul imputes to the person described in the seventh chapter of the Romans, namely, that it does not mean a determined and settled purpose of the mind, but only a certain kind of willingness, an unstable and weak desire for what is good, such as may be found in too many persons who are not good. I have however confirmed this view by shewing that the Apostle attributes the volition of good to the person described by him, in such a way as plainly to take away from him all power of performing what is good, ver. 16, 18; in which latter verse I have noted the antithesis in the Apostle's words, "for to will is present with me, but how to perform that which is good that I find not;" as if he had said, Having the knowledge of the law, and being persuaded of its due obligation, it is easy for me to will the good which it commands: but the faculty of doing this is so far from me, that how to perform it I find not, inasmuch as the law of sin which is in my flesh, and under whose dominion I am, is for ever carrying me away to the contrary. And is this to be called a determined and settled purpose of the mind? is such a volition of good as this to be considered the characteristic mark of the regenerate man? This is our answer to Paræus, and we may wait in vain for Dr. Tully to bring forward any thing solid against it. Dr. Tully's following remarks are perfectly astonishing.

"I do not understand," he says, "what he means by saying that the terms 'to will,' and 'to perform,' are opposed to one another, unless he means that subordinate terms are opposites, (and if he means that he will never prove it,) for if so, it would follow that a good work is done without the will, notwithstanding that the will is the root and principle of all moral action. Therefore 'to will' and 'to perform' cannot be opposite terms." And again, "If to will and to perform are to be considered as opposite terms, not even St. Paul himself could perform a good work: for the very will of performing it would prevent him, since, in opposite terms, if one is granted the other must be denied." It seems perfectly astonishing how such a conclusion could be drawn from my words, or rather the words of Amyraldus, to whom I referred

in the note: they are as follow: "The Apostle here draws a difference between 'willing what is good,' and 'doing it,' ver. 18. For these are so distinguished and opposed, as that 'to will' is attributed to our faculties, while 'to perform' is not so by any means: 'to will,' signifies only a certain inclination or tendency, but not a definite, anxious, perfect, or settled will, for such a will of necessity produces action." My meaning is merely this: the Apostle so distinguishes between and opposes the two terms 'to will' and 'to do,' as to allow the former to the person whom he is describing, while he altogether denies that he possesses the latter; and thence it necessarily follows that St. Paul meant by the expression 'to will what is good,' an ineffectual will, such an one as did not lead to action. Nothing can be plainer than this: and therefore what fair-minded person could impute to me the opinion that 'to will' and 'to do' were simply and of themselves opposed to one another, in the same sense as logicians speak of opposite terms, so that whoever wills what is good, for that very reason does not do it: and he who does what is good does it unwillingly, or as Dr. Tully says, without will? and yet these are the absurdities he attributes to me. Surely that must be blind charity which could believe that the Doctor, while writing such things, seriously endeavoured to keep to truth and honesty.

SECT. IX. τὸ θέλειν κατεργάζεσθαι καλὸν

§ 22. My objections to Paræus touching the hatred of sin, are replied to by Dr. Tully in the following way. In the first place he rejects the example of Medea, which amongst others I had brought forward to prove that a certain kind of hatred of sin may be found even in the greatest sinners: "For it appears," says he, "that this woman was notorious for her wickedness: and although at intervals she struggled under some slight pangs of conscience, (which may be observed in the most desperate sinners,) still it is quite certain, from Euripides and Seneca, that she proceeded resolutely and as it were at full sail to her bloody deed." It is so, I acknowledge: but is it not also as certain, that a person of this kind is plainly described by the Apostle in this chapter? surely it is; for this man is said 'to be sold under sin,' which expression is not commonly used in Holy Scripture, except of most wicked sinners, as I have shewn above. But Dr. Tully pro-

Diss. p. 24.

SECT. IX. v. 17—20.

ceeds: "But this," says he, "the Apostle denies of himself, when he says that it was not himself who did the ill, which he would not, but sin dwelling in him:" forsooth the reverend gentleman seems to have thought that the Apostle in these verses excuses the man whom he is describing. But in this he is much mistaken: for St. Paul is not endeavouring to excuse sinners of any kind, not to say himself: but the whole of his discourse is to justify the law, and to prove that the law is not of itself the cause of sin and death, but that it is holy, just, and good, as appears from the scope of the whole passage, and especially from the sixteenth verse, "If then I do that which I would not I consent unto the law that it is good." For surely this is the strongest argument in vindication of the holiness of the law, that wicked men having the knowledge of the law, approve of it while they transgress it, and even wish to obey it up to a certain point, their conscience scourging them in silence for sins committed against it. The Apostle's meaning therefore from the seventeenth to the twentieth verse, is plainly this: When a carnal man imbued with a knowledge of the law sins against it, it is not so much the man himself who sins, i. e. the mind of the man, (for each man's mind is himself,) as 'the animal part' in him, which is enslaved to sin, and which is called in the twenty-third verse 'the law of sin in his members;' whence it follows, that in the opinion even of the worst men, (in so far as they are men, and have the power of judgment,) the law of God is holy, just, and good: which the Apostle had undertaken to prove.

τὸ θηριῶδες

Diss. p. 24, 25.

§ 23. I next find the following remarks: "Sensible men will be but little disturbed by the popular pageant which the Harmonist gets up in the following strain;" (O how cleverly said!) "'Great praise indeed to be so regenerate as to hate sin, when no passion or excitement of appetite induces us to commit it; but as soon as the opportunity of doing wrong offers itself, and some desire urged us to commit sin, then heartily to love it.' I have quoted the whole passage, so that no dispute may arise from its being imperfectly represented. But I wish he would again consider how invidious and inconsistent it all is." Let us therefore, according to his wish, reconsider the whole question. Dr. Tully first en-

II. Diss. ix. 15. p. 106.

quires, "What words of St. Paul prove that the person he is describing is affected in such a way?" I answer, those words which speak of the man there described as 'hating sin, and yet doing it, as being brought into captivity of the law of sin in his members, and, even so, sold under sin.' For hence we have thus argued in the Harmony. "No one hates sin at the very moment he is committing it. Therefore all that hatred which the man here represented felt towards sin, must be referred to that time when either concupiscence had not yet been excited by objects presented to it, or it had not yet overcome the opposition of the reason. After concupiscence prevailed, it follows as a matter of course, that as long as it kept the reason in its power, there was no hatred of sin." Here follow the words, quoted by Dr. Tully, "Great praise," &c., and I leave it to the judgment of learned men to decide whether they deserve the Doctor's derision and contempt, as if they were a popular pageant. Quintilian's hint seems to have occurred to Dr. Tully, namely, that "insincerity proceeds as far as this, that what we cannot refute by speaking, we may put down by objections[z]." He presently cavils at my words, "heartily loves;" I pass over the extraordinary syllogism he attributes to me, because (as he truly observes) "there is no handling such logic." What he says concerning St. Peter deserves consideration. "When Peter," he says, "thrice denied his Lord, did he heartily love the miserable deed?" I answer, Certainly he did. When St. Peter denied Christ, he heartily loved his sad deed, not as such, (not even the greatest sinner loves sin as sin,) but as the means of escaping death which he was dreading, and of saving his life. This is cleverly explained by Bucer, in his Enarration of the seventh chapter of the Romans, where, after other good remarks, he thus descants on the case of St. Peter. "When Peter, struck by the woman's question, denied Christ, two propositions presented themselves to his mind. 'Risking one's life must be avoided,' and 'the denial of Christ must be avoided:' in the one, natural feeling and desire prevailed; in the other, the feeling and will of the law and Spirit of God. When therefore

SECT. IX.

p. 106.

p. 368. edit. Basil.

[z] "Hucusque simulatio procedit, ut quæ dicendo refutare non possumus quasi fastidiendo calcemus."

SECT. IX. the power of the Holy Spirit deserted him, the thought of impending death prevailed, while the thought of denying Christ was banished: and therefore he denied Him. For to the proposition, 'The risking one's life must be avoided,' he added, 'By denying Jesus you shall avoid this present risk of life:' and so his conclusion was, 'Therefore Jesus must be denied,' and deny he did. The deliberation indeed was short: for violent fear put a stop to it: yet, so quick is the operation of the mind, this must also have occurred to him. 'To deny Christ, the Saviour and Son of God, is perdition.' If now Peter could have persisted in the thought that the denial of Christ the Saviour must be avoided, he might have easily added, 'This Jesus is Christ your Saviour,' and so with his premises established, his conclusion would have followed, 'Therefore Jesus my Master must not be denied:' and thus he would have stood firm in his confession. And so he did both what he was unwilling and what he wished to do: what he was unwilling to do, before he was so terror-struck by the impending danger, and ceased to think what it was to deny Christ, and when that thought was brought back to him by his Lord's look, for then he wept bitterly: what he wished to do, when he actually determined what to answer the damsel: for then, 'The present danger must be avoided,' prevailed, and with it the assumption, 'By denying Jesus you shall avoid this:' therefore he concluded, 'Jesus must be denied,' and denied Him." I am not aware what Dr. Tully means when he so seriously finds fault with me, that "because I speak so contemptuously of indwelling sin, that I only mean by it a 'certain kind of desire.'" I am speaking of actual sin, distinguished from actual concupiscence, excited and brought into action by means of certain objects, where I must either speak of desire indefinitely, or of some kind of desire, or of all, or of none. I cannot, however, but deeply regret that Dr. Tully has shewn throughout such a desire to cavil at every thing, I say, be it ever so inoffensive.

Diss. p. 25.

§ 24. Dr. Tully makes no answer of any consequence to what I had urged against Paræus, who objects that 'it is the peculiar privilege of the regenerate to consent to the law of God, and to take delight in it:' except that he quarrels with me about the meaning of the word 'delight.' "'To delight,'"

συνήδομαι

he says, "is more worthy of the gravity of St. Paul's discourse, than merely 'to agree,' and these two words have never been before confused by any good Greek author." The answer to this is easy. The phrase, 'to delight in the law,' is in Scripture an ἅπαξ λεγόμενον, and as far as I am aware, is no where to be met with in the heathen writers. But the verb, 'to delight in,' joined with other nouns, is of frequent occurrence in Greek authors, and signifies 'to be affected by pleasure together with another,' or 'to be glad:' and so the Latin translator has well expressed it, by coining a new word, which would give its whole force, 'condelector.' 'To delight' therefore 'in the law,' (if we wish to keep to the strict meaning of the word,) must here signify the joint pleasure or delight of the law, and man who is under it. But surely it is improper to attribute pleasure or delight to the law. What follows then? The law is said to delight and rejoice in those things which it determines to be good, and commands to be done: man, on the other hand, is said to delight in (or with) the law when he consents to its judgment, that is, when he determines those things to be good and proper to be done which the law recommends to him as such. If the Apostle had said, 'I rejoice' in the law, it would have rather favoured the Doctor's interpretation. There is no reason, therefore, to induce us to believe that 'to delight in the law,' in ver. 22, means any thing more than 'to consent to the law,' in ver. 16. And so Calvin turns the Apostle's words, ver. 22, 'consenting to the law after the inner man.' But there is no necessity for us to carry on this dispute about the meaning of the word 'to delight.' It has been proved both by reason and the plain testimony of Scripture, that some sort of delight in the law of God is to be found even in the unregenerate. But to those who say that these passages of Scripture do not mean a true and real delight in the law of God, but only a fluctuating and unstable, I have made the following reply: "How is it that these persons do not see that the same remark equally, nay, in a much greater degree, applies to the passage before us? For St. Paul certainly does not attribute to the person here represented a firm and settled delight in the law of God, but one of such sort, as, when the allurements of the

SECT. IX.

Diss. p. 26.

σύμφημι
συνήδεσθαι
τῷ νόμῳ

σύνηδομαι

condelectari

ἐφήδομαι

II. Diss. ix. 17. p. 108, 109.

SECT. IX.

flesh present themselves, is so overcome and absorbed by them, that the wretched man is at last quite led captive to
ver. 22, 23. the law of sin in his members. But who can object to the unregenerate having such a delight as this, or who attribute it to the regenerate?" On this point Dr. Tully is perfectly silent.

§ 25. Dr. Tully now proceeds to what I have said against
Diss. p. 27. Paræus concerning 'the inner man.' "As to what he says about the inner and new man being so opposed, he proves himself to be ignorant that many great divines differ with him on that point." Now it seems very extraordinary that he should not have known that many more and greater divines agreed with me therein. For it is certain that nearly all the ancient and very many modern divines are of opinion that the mind, or rational soul of man, is meant by the expression 'inner man.'

This has been shewn to be so by I. Arminius, in his Dissertation on the seventh chapter of the Romans. Even Estius, who in other points supports Dr. Tully's interpretation, agrees with us on this. His remarks on the passage are
p. 66, &c. [p. 102. ed. 1614.] as follow: "I interpret 'the inner man,' to mean 'the mind,' and not the new or renewed man. For the Apostle does not mean the same by the inner and new man, as neither does he by the outward and old man. For even in sinners there is the inner, but not as yet the renewed man. In the righteous however, the term inner man is coincident with the new man." By which he means, that in this passage the inner man coincides with the new, according to his hypothesis that St. Paul is here speaking of a regenerate person, whose inner man is renewed by the Holy Spirit: he acknowledges, nevertheless, that 'inner man' by itself, means nothing more than 'the mind,' and therefore, that it may be applied as well to sinners as to the righteous. Thus we see that Estius by no means agreed with Dr. Tully and Paræus, in supposing that because the term 'inner man' is applied to the person described in this chapter, it could therefore be fairly inferred that the Apostle is here speaking of a regenerate person. Besides, I have proved most incontrovertibly that the term 'inner man' in this passage, means the same as 'mind' or rational soul. It is easy to conjecture why

SECT. IX.

Dr. Tully does not make any reply to all this: but though the reverend gentleman had no answer to produce, he is not however slow to bring forward a kind of objection to our arguments: for he thus proceeds. "Whatever be the meaning of the term 'inner man,' the Apostle certainly opposes it to 'the flesh,' and 'the law in his members,' and it scarcely will be doubted by any one who has seriously studied the Scriptures, 'the flesh' often signifies in them the whole nature of man, in its depraved condition since the fall." I answer: We readily acknowledge that the term 'flesh' frequently means in Scripture the whole nature of man as derived from Adam: but in this wider sense 'the flesh' is not opposed to the inner man, but to the Spirit; as in the passage quoted by Dr. Tully, "That which is born of the flesh is flesh; and that which is born of the Spirit is Spirit." Whereas 'the inner man' is here opposed by the Apostle to his bodily 'members,' and affections which spring from them. For to those words, 'I delight' or 'consent to the law of God after the inner man,' the Apostle presently adds, 'but I see another law in my members.' To this Dr. Tully replies: "It is to no purpose that the Harmonist understands by members, merely those of the body; for so all kinds of desires which are contrary to the law are figuratively called, of which original sin is as it were the body, when it makes use of them as of the service of a body and its members." But this is plainly to no purpose: for although I do not deny that the Apostle elsewhere calls the whole habit of sin 'the body,' and its various parts 'the members,' yet I do altogether deny that he uses this figure in this passage. For in the first place, the members of which the Apostle speaks, he calls 'his own,' and not the members of sin: for he says, 'in my members:' and in the next place, there is an evident distinction between a twofold law and the abode of each. The law of sin is opposed to the law of God: the law of God is seated in the inner man, or in the mind of man, whence also it is called 'the law of the mind:' the law of sin is seated in the members: therefore the members do not constitute the whole of fallen man, but only that part of him which is distinguished from his mind, that is, his body and bodily affections. And lastly, if any one is desirous

ver. 18, 22, 23.

Joh. 3. 6.

ver. 22.

SECT. IX.

really to understand the Apostle's meaning, and to know what 'the law of sin in his members' is, let him read the fifth verse of this chapter, and the twelfth, thirteenth, and fourteenth verses of the sixth. The case is so evident, that we have even Estius again to support us. For thus he comments on the twenty-third verse of this chapter. "I find another law in my members, that is, in my body, and the whole outward man, which during this life is not renewed but is corrupted; and he says 'in his members,' because in certain members the rebellion is chiefly perceived which this law of sin which he is speaking of excites." Dr. Tully's next objection to the Harmonist is, because he explains the struggle in this chapter to be between the sensitive appetite and the reason or intellect imbued with the knowledge of the law. This may be easily refuted by what has been already said: and therefore we need not detain the reader by the consideration of it.

2Cor.4.16.

§ 26. Dr. Tully's remarks on my answer to Paræus' fifth argument drawn from the twenty-fourth and twenty-fifth verses, are certainly astonishing. In the first place he attributes to me some absurd kind of argument, such as, "He who does or says things which might be consistent with a regenerate person, is to be accounted unregenerate: the person in Rom. 7. is of that description: therefore" &c. Again: "The person described by St. Paul mourns over his sins, &c.: some unregenerate person mourns over his sins: therefore that person is some unregenerate person." But where has he found the author of the Harmony arguing so very absurdly? I beg the reader to refer to the paragraph in that work, and he will wonder how a man of so much seriousness could find any opening for treating a solemn subject so lightly. But this is nothing. Shortly afterwards, while endeavouring to convict the Harmonist of the grossest contradiction, he himself is convicted of downright falsehood: "We must not pass over," he says, "what the Harmonist forces upon us, that the 'giving of thanks' in ver. 25, may well be applied to an unregenerate person. 'I thank God through Jesus Christ.' But he presently corrects this opinion by his wonderful parenthesis, (not his own however,) which is to be transferred to the regenerate Paul." Now

Diss. p. 30, &c.

II.Diss.ix. 19. p. 110.

where, I ask, has the Harmonist ever said that the 'thanksgiving' in ver. 25, may be applied to an unregenerate person? I give the reader my words: "The Apostle adds, in the twenty-fourth verse, an exclamation or expression of misery suited to the man whom he had been describing in the preceding verses: shewing his miserable, and, if you regard the law, actually deplorable condition. And then in ver. 25, he sets forth the grace of God through Christ, by which alone he himself had been delivered from this most wretched state, and a way of deliverance had been made and thrown open to others: which 'thanksgiving' is to be read in a parenthesis." SECT. IX. p. 111.

I say here indeed, that this expression of woe, ver. 24, applies to the man whom St. Paul had been describing in the former verses: but that the 'thanksgiving' in ver. 25 must be read in a parenthesis and referred to the person of St. Paul. After this wandering, Dr. Tully at last proceeds to the argument in favour of my opinion, taken from the twenty-fourth and twenty-fifth verses, and which I had called most incontrovertible. It assumes the following form: "The state of the person described in this chapter is a state of misery, a state of sin and death, a state, in short, from which whomsoever are Christ's are delivered: the state of the regenerate is not of such a kind: therefore the state of the regenerate is not the state of the person described in this chapter." In answer to this, Dr. Tully in the first place turns it into ridicule, as usual: and then briefly replies, that "the whole argument is nothing else but begging the question." But is it not most plainly confirmed by St. Paul's words in the twenty-fourth and twenty-fifth verses? Surely it is. For the person described in the former verses, is in the twenty-fourth called by St. Paul 'a wretched miserable man,' and is said to be subject to 'the body of death,' that is, the dominion of sin, and so to death. In the twenty-fifth verse, the grace of God through Christ is extolled, by which alone man can obtain deliverance from this misery and body of death. What can be plainer? But Dr. Tully goes on: "Will he deny then, that he himself is a sinner, and wretched on this very account, and that in the state in which he is, he daily, nay hourly, deserves death?" p. 111. Diss. p. 32, 33.

SECT. IX. He concludes, "In this at least let him have regard to his own modesty." I answer: I willingly confess before God and men, that I was once a most grievous sinner, and therefore most miserable: and I acknowledge, that even now, I offend in many things: but I trust that by the grace of God, without arrogance, I can deny that I am a sinner in the sense that the word is used in Scripture, or that I am under the body of death, of which the Apostle speaks, and therefore miserable. But whatever I may be, (and I wish that the reverend gentleman would allow me to stand or fall to my own master,) I altogether deny that a regenerate or truly religious person is ever called in Scripture 'a wretched' or 'miserable man,' not to say miserable because he is subject to the body of death of which the Apostle speaks. Let Dr. Tully produce a passage of this kind from Holy Scripture, if he can. But on the contrary, the whole of Scripture, be it prophetical, evangelical, or apostolical, every where declares such a man to be blessed and happy. Moreover, however Dr. Tully may despise my argument, I know of a most learned man who for some time kept most tenaciously to the erroneous interpretation of this passage, but afterwards, convinced by a more serious consideration of this one argument, yielded to the truth. This was Nicolas Zitinius, who having taken upon himself, at the desire of his friends, the task of explaining this seventh chapter according to their supposition who think that from the fourteenth verse of it St. Paul speaks of himself as regenerate, and having earnestly applied himself to the undertaking, when at length he came to the words, "O wretched man that I am! who shall deliver me from the body of this death? I thank God through Jesus Christ our Lord," stopped like one astounded: and presently coming to himself broke out in the following words: "But where is this deliverance? where this blessing for which the Apostle so thanks God? was it that it was necessary for him to be kept in such slavery to sin? That cannot be proved to me in any way: and therefore I equally thank the Father of lights for vouchsafing the light of His truth to shine upon me, in being delivered from so great an error." Would that Dr. Tully would imitate his example.

§ 27. Dr. Tully again inveighs against what I had said touching the necessity of reading the words, 'I thank God,' &c. in a parenthesis, as if spoken by the Apostle in his own person. He had before spoken of this parenthesis of mine as being extraordinary. But why is it extraordinary for the Apostle, after describing the wretched condition of man under the law, to shew by a few words enclosed in a short parenthesis, that this description did not apply to himself, and moreover, to cut off any opening for despair in this wretched man by shewing that his condition was not altogether deplorable, but that a sure remedy was at hand, if only he would embrace the grace of Christ: and that he then should return to his original purpose in the twenty-sixth verse, and sum up very briefly the whole of his preceding discourse? Should this appear so absurd, as to be obliged, besides attributing to the Apostle an irrelevant and really absurd argument, (such as we have proved Dr. Tully to do,) to distort the phrases used by the Apostle, from the fourteenth to the twenty-fifth verse, into a meaning totally at variance with their accustomed sense throughout the whole of Scripture? But there is not wanting a similar example of a parenthesis being used by St. Paul in a like change of person, and that too in this same Epistle: the passage is in the third chapter, where in the fifth verse St. Paul speaking in the character of the Jews, (according to the agreement of the most learned interpreters,) says, "But if our unrighteousness commend the righteousness of God, what shall we say? Is God unrighteous, Who taketh vengeance?" And then in a parenthesis, he says in his own person, "I speak as a man," &c. He then returns to the objection brought forward, and again assumes the person of the unbelieving Jews, ver. 7. "For if the truth of God hath more abounded through my lie unto His glory," &c. The reader may refer to Grotius on this passage.

SECT. IX.

Diss. p. 34.

ver. 5, 6, 7.

§ 28. In the last place, Dr. Tully is displeased, because in my answer to the last objection of Paræus I said by the way that it was not necessary to render the words *αὐτὸς ἐγὼ*, in ver. 26, 'I myself:' since they might be better expressed by 'I that man.' This also appears to him extraordinary: but why? is it wonderful or new for the Apostle to say, as if in

ille ego

SECT. IX. his own person, by using the pronoun *I*, that which does not refer to himself but to others? I have clearly shewn (whatever Dr. Tully may say to the contrary) that the Apostle uses this change of person in other places: and even in this very chapter, ver. 9, unless we wish to do violence to the Apostle's words. Does he think it wonderful that I should render *αὐτὸς* by 'that one?' even beginners in the Greek language, know that this use of the word is quite common. Whence before Hugo Grotius, James Capel, who certainly was not ignorant of Greek, and who in other respects agreed with Dr. Tully's interpretation, thus paraphrased the Apostle's words, 'So then I myself,' &c. "I thank God because I that man, who was by nature the servant of sin," &c. There are some who render the words by 'I the same man,' as if the Apostle said, 'I, one and the same person, with the mind serve the law of God; but with the flesh, the law of sin:' which version agrees very well with our view of the question. So Erasmus, Bucer, Hammond, and long before them, the Arabian interpreter. But the fortunes of Greece do not depend on this. Nor is it necessary, as the Doctor himself acknowledges, to pursue this point of grammar farther, if only we have proved by some arguments taken from the subject itself, that the Apostle, from the fourteenth verse of this chapter, is describing a man under the law and destitute of the grace of the Gospel. "Of this," (to close my Apology with Dr. Tully's own words,) "let honest and thoughtful readers judge."

INDEX.

A.

Abraham, promise to, not through the law, 188.
Adam, descendants of, without a revelation, bound by natural law alone, 160. all descendants of, as such, subject to death without hope of resurrection, 159.
African Canons, 169.
ἀκμὴν, meaning of the word, 362.
Alemaynus, 175.
Algasias, questions of, 9.
Altisiodorensis, 175.
Alms, an external act of repentance, 59.
Ambrose, St., 183, 271. Pseudo, quotation from, 182. on Rom. 7. 14, 365.
Amolo, Archbishop of Lyons, letter of, to Gothescalcus, 328.
Amyraldus, 368, 390.
Anabaptists, condemned by Augsburg Confession, 320.
Ἄνομος, 387.
Ἀνόμως, 387.
Antinomianism, worst kind of, supported by Dr. Tully, 245.
Antinomians, execrable tenets of, can be traced from the Lutherans, 68, 82. argument against, 89. followers of Simon, 143. opponents of St. James, *ib.*
Antiquity, preferred to Calvin, 230. to be reverenced next after Holy Scripture, 231.
Apostacy, total, intended Heb. 6. and 10. 180. of true believers, 313. case of Saul and Judas, 314. danger of, taught by St. Peter, 315.
Aretius, on Rom. 7. 14, 385.
Arles, Council of, 80, 327.
Arminius, J., on Rom. 7. 396.
Article eleventh, to be explained by the Homily, 217, 218. explained away, by Dr. Tully, 230. sixteenth, 309.
Articles of Lambeth, 230. decree prefixed to, 343.
Assent, none without trust, 115.
Athanasius, St., 197.
Attrition, 22.
Augsburg, Confession of, 292—297. drawn up by Melancthon, first of all Confessions, *ib.*
Augustine, St., opinion of, on love, 20. carried away in his zeal against Pelagius, 167. in refuting a new heresy took unrecognised grounds, *ib.* held that some after conversion had lived without sin, 169. quoted, 211, 212, 273, 274. confesses faith, &c., may be lost, 324. opinion of, on Rom. 7. before Pelagian controversy, and after, 365. moderns opposed to, 366. writings of, not much known to Greek Fathers, 367. not followed by all the Latins, *ib.*
Author of Law and the Gospel the same, 97.
Αὐτὸς ἐγὼ, how rendered in Latin, 402. how paraphrased by Grotius, Capel, &c., *ib.*

B.

Baptism, Sacrament of, 179.
Baron, Robert, on trust, 121.
Basil the Great, 8, 269.
Bede, the first, in his time, of doctors of the Church, 169. uncertain on Rom. 7. 367.
Bellarmine's view of imputed and inherent righteousness the true one, 82, 306. on condignity, 359. moderation of, 360.
Bernard, St., caution of, on sin, 176.
Bernhard, 77.
Beza, on Rom. 7. 14, 385.
Bilson, against the Puritans, 233.
Bohemian Confession, or Waldensian, 322, 323.
Bucer approved of the phrase 'faith perfected by love,' 15. rebuked those

Protestants who objected to it, 15. 368, 402. on St. Peter's denial, 393.

C.

Cælestinus, Bp. of Rome, opinion on new statements of St. Austin, 343. note o.
Cajetan, 360.
Calvin, 36, 45. on Luke 18. 13, 14, 47. disciples of, corrupt the doctrine of Christ's satisfaction, 56. wrong in doctrine and discipline, 341. on Rom. 7. 14, 384. interprets ver. 14. of an unregenerate person, *ib.*
Canon, concerning preachers, 231, 232, 329.
Capel, James, 192, 402.
Carthusianus, 368.
Casaubon, 283.
Cassander, 295.
Castellio, 368.
Catholic teaching, on the state of the first man before the fall, 162. followed in the Harmony, 234.
Catholics, Roman, have exposed the fearful doctrines of many of the reformed, 69. we must join with, in openly condemning dangerous dogmas, 70. certain who teach that man may commit venial sins in the way of contempt, to be abhorred, 176.
Censurer, rejects ancient teaching, as new, 3. calumnies of the, 4, 5. trifling of the, 12. attributes to faith an operation unheard of before, 31. absurdities and contradictions refuted, 54, 55. inconsistency of, 64. contradicts St. Paul, 68. view of the moral law, 70, 71. lays the foundations of Antinomianism, 74. argument of, from contraries examined, 111. similes of, support the author's doctrine, not his own, 112. gross heterodoxy of, 126. frivolous distinction of, between a right 'to,' and a right 'in' a thing, 130, 131. carelessness of, 146. calumnies of, 216.
Christ alone has satisfied Divine Justice, 2. in His Sermon explained the law moral, 71. requires its observance, *ib.* has not died for elect alone, 330. His satisfaction universal, 331.
Christians, bound to a higher degree of virtue than Gentiles, 162. cases of, who have grievously sinned, 178. case of incestuous, 179. unfruitful, cut off, and delivered to Satan, 312, 313.
Chrysostom, St., 8, 84, 196, 272.
Church, Catholic, held it orthodox to say a man is justified by keeping moral precepts, 96.
Church of England, Catholic in doctrine and polity, 231. appeal to, 275.
Churches, reformed, appeal to, 291.
Clement, St., of Alexandria, on the words "Thy faith hath saved thee," 63, 166, 362. of Rome, testimony of, 57. true explanation of the satisfaction of Christ, *ib.* on universal propitiation of Christ, 81.
'*Condelectari*,' 395.
Condition, none enjoined in the Gospel which is not a condition of justification, 38, 39.
Confession of Augsburg, 258, 292—297. Wurtemberg, 297, 298. Strasburg, 299—301. Saxony, 321, 322. Bohemia, 322, 323.
Confidence, justifying, Censurer's view of, 98. according to Censurer, formal cause of justifying faith, 99. productive of obedience, 100. many profess, who are far from salvation, 103. Censurer's same as full assurance, 105.
Contrition, true sorrow for sin, 22. without faith, 296. with faith, 297.
Corinthians, why carnal, 380.
Cornelius, 32. case of, considered, 33. a proselyte of the gate, *ib.* alms and prayers of, accepted by God, 34.
Covenant, distinction between Mosaic and Gospel, only according to the letter, 164. with Abraham, the Gospel itself, 165. none after the fall, beside the Gospel, 164. of works, 195. of Mount Sinai, 205.
'*Credere alicui*,' and '*in aliquem*,' Hebraic use of, 119. Augustine's explanation of the phrases, 120.
Cresci, Council of, 328.
Crisp, Tobias, Sermons of, 74. supports his teaching from the Censurer, *ib.* asserts no repentance is necessary for forgiveness, 76, 259.
Cyprian, St., 268, 362, 364.
Χωρὶς νόμου, 387.

D.

Damascene, John, St., 362.
Damnation, cause of, sin in man, 335.
Davenant, 42, 354.
Dionysius of Alexandria, 197.
Discrepancy of St. Paul and St. James apparent only, 4.
Distrust and incredulitythe same things, if referred to the same object, 111. proved to be the same with incredulity by familiar examples, 113.
Divines, modern, to be avoided, 3. reformed, many, in opposing Roman

Catholics, have run into absurdities, 69. of Anglican Church generally well versed in Catholic writings, 70. foreign, have erred against their own confessions, *ib.* catalogue of modern, agreeing with the author on Rom. 7. 14, 368.
Dominic a Soto, 360.
Dordt, Synod of, Canons of, rejected by the English Church, 230. condemned, under name of the Lambeth Articles, *ib.*
Dorotheus, 363.

E.

Ebbo of Grenoble, 328.
Edward VI., Catechism of, 319. Dr. Hickman's perversion of, *ib.* 320.
Elect, the, unknown to men, 79.
Election, feeling of, follows only upon faith and love, &c. absolute and irrespective, not taught in reformed Churches, 109. perception of, confined by our Church only to the godly, 110. free mercy of God, 338.
Ἐνεργεῖσθαι, explanation of the word, 17, 18. how it ought to be translated, *ib.* must be used passively, *ib.* so used by ancient writers, 19.
Ennodius, 364.
Erasmus, 36, 368, 402.
Estius, 36, 152. on the phrase 'inner man,' 396.
Eucharist, offered for forgiveness of sins, 179.
Ἐφήδομαι, 395.

F.

Faber Stapulensis, 368.
Faith and love may be distinct in the subject, 16. ἐνέργεια of, 31. by itself not a "swarm of virtues," but considered so by St. Paul, 52. instrumentality of, notions of, sophistical, 60. assertions of sole instrumentality of, contradict Holy Scripture, *ib.* no where said in Holy Scripture to be the *one* instrument, 61. special influence of, in obtaining righteousness, mere question of words, 64, 65. works, &c., true view of efficacy of, 66. without love useless, 68. three acts of, justification not joined to either by itself, 97, 98. justifying, pretended difficulty of explaining, unreal, 102. no true explanation of, which excludes love, 104. and assent the same, 112. a man may have all, yet no love, 114. Christian, true distinction of, various acts of, 116, 117. and differs from trust only as general and particular, 121. *faith*, assent to the whole Gospel, *trust* to its promises, *ib.* cannot be separated in the matter of the judgment from good works, 127. used by synecdoche for universal spiritual righteousness, 143. inseparable from Baptism, 270. alone directly leads to Christ, therefore said to justify, 282, 283.
'*Faith in blood*,' phrase, uncommon in Holy Scripture, 150.
'*Faithful*,' twofold sense of, 263.
Familists, arose from Lutheran teaching, 68.
Farindon, 368.
Fathers, reverence for the, proof of attachment to the Church, 3. before Pelagius taught the possibility of perfect obedience through grace, 166. teach that few have attained perfection of virtue, 167. in what sense they denied the fulfilment of the law by the grace of Christ, 169. writings of the, to be studied continually, 210. great danger of neglecting, *ib.* teaching of, followed by English divines, 232. appeal to the, 264. how they understood 'by faith only,' 265. opinion of, on Rom. 7. 14, 361. twenty-two against Dr. Tully's four, 364, 365.
Faustus, the Manichæan, 207, 327.
Fear of God, servile without love, 22. filial, *ib.* 297.
Fell, Bp., advice of, 3.
Field, Dean, explanation of phrase 'by faith only,' 286, 287, 353.
Figure of change of persons, 386. Vid. 1 Cor. 4. 3, 4; compared with ver. 6; Rom. 3. 7; 1 Cor. 6. 12, 15, and 10. 23, 29, 30; Gal. 2. 18.
'*Fitness*,' explained, 345.
Forgiveness, an act not extraneous to justification, 45—48. difference between simple and 'legitimate,' or conditional, 52. an act of free mercy, *ib.*

G.

Gabriel, 175.
Gataker, Thomas, 133, 134. agrees with Placæus, 134. epistle to Baxter, 149.
Gnostics, 178.
God, no respecter of persons, 32. does not forgive without justifying, 51. does not order impossibilities, 168. not the cause of sin or death, 336. would have all men saved, 340. not to be called our debtor, 359.

Good works, a necessary condition, 2. whether of the same rank as faith, 65, 66. more than mere signs of faith, 127.
Gospel covenant, benefits of, 29. the whole comprised under repentance and forgiveness, 48, 62. in what sense not a law of perfect obedience, 155. enjoins nothing, not attainable by grace, 166. does not enjoin impossibilities, proved by reason, 171. all degrees of virtue enjoined by, matters of precept, *ib.* does not denounce for every failing, *ib.* indulgence of, seen in grant of pardon of all sins, 176. lay hid under the law, 198.
Gothescalcus, revived Predestinarian heresy, 327—329.
Gregory of Nazianzen, 8, 364.
Grotius, confounds justification with reward, 23. his work on the Satisfaction of Christ a shield against the Socinians, 56. too much given to Socinian interpretations, 151. explanation of the word ἱλαστήριον, *ib.*

H.

Haimo, 367.
Hall, Bp. of Norwich, 234.
Hammond, 44, 45, 234, 368, 402.
Harmonist, why considered an innovator, 230. great injury done to, from the charge of Socinianism, 242.
Harmony, object of the, 2. teaching of the, Catholic, *ib.* method of proceeding in, 5. read and approved of by Bp. Nicholson, 349. how published, and when, *ib.* author's opinion of, 350.
Heaven, exclusion from, for certain definite sins, 172.
Hebrews, Epistle to the, considered by most to be St. Paul's, 187.
Heresy, of Predestinarians, 327.
Hickman, Dr., heterodoxy of, 321.
Hilary, St., 269. of Arles, Epistle to Augustine, 343. note o.
Hincmar, Bp. of Rheims, 327, 328.
Holiness, imputed, notion of, refuted, 86. retains grace of justification, 88.
Homily, on Salvation, 217—219. authorized interpreter of eleventh Article, 276—278, 282, 307. on Repentance, 302, 303. on the Resurrection, 315. the Nativity, 316. on the Passion, 332.
Hooker, on Justification, 279. illustrates teaching of the Homily, 280.
Hooper, Bp., on perseverance, 317. testimony of, on universal redemption, 333—336. followed Melancthon, 337.
Hope, difference of, from faith, 21. faith must precede, *ib.* none without love, *ib.* true, consequent only on conditions performed, 116.
Huberians, 82.

I.

'*Ibis ad Cæsarem*,' dishonesty of author of, 318.
Ignatius, 19.
Inability, natural and moral, distinction between without foundation, 163.
Indefectibility, doctrine of, supported by some English divines, given to theology of Geneva, 309. opposed by all antiquity, 324. originated in the Valentinians, 326. rejected by Church of England, because opposed to all Catholic consent, 329, 330. (See Canon.)
Innovation, charge of, explained and refuted, 230.
Interpretation, reasonableness of, pursued in Harmony, 6.
Irenæus, St., 9, 96, 97, 190, 265. opposer of Valentinians and Gnostics, 326.
Isidorus Clarius, 20.
'*Israel*, masters of,' lived in ignorance of grace, 203.
Izates, story of, 34.

J.

Jackson, 368.
James, St., argument of, clear, 6, 7. speaks of works of faith and grace, 7. reasons for rejecting his Epistle, 8. ancient opinion that he wrote against perverters of St. Paul, 11. advanced no new dogma, 14. supported by the whole of Scripture, *ib.* by royal law, understands the moral law set forth by Christ, 91.
James, King, directions of, to students in divinity, 232.
Jerome, St., teaching of, on the possibility of God's commands, 168. against Pelagius, 209.
Jerusalem, Council of, 196.
Jewel, 233.
Jews, trust of, in Mosaic covenant opposed by St. Paul, 14. not confined to letter of the law, 214.
Jezebel, in Rev. 2. 20, understood of the wife of a bishop, 178. of the Gnostics, *ib.*

Jovinian, 327.
Judaizing Christians opposed by St. Paul, 142. maintained Mosaic ceremonies were necessary for salvation, *ib.*
Judas, case of, 296.
Justification, of which St. James speaks, 7. force of the word, 23. what it is, 24. may be where no reward is, 25. is unto life and salvation, 28. '*Justification*,' 'life,' 'salvation,' used promiscuously, *ib.* does not *necessarily* mean forgiveness of sins, 50. an act of justice, 52, 53. of the Gospel not bare and simple forgiveness, *ib.* an act of grace and mercy also, *ib.* forgiveness must be granted either before, or in the act of, or after, 55. the first obtained by internal works, 59. preserved by external, 59, 60. not attributed in Holy Scripture to faith alone, 61. of a sinner only called 'justification' in three places in Holy Scripture, *ib.* attributed by St. Luke 18. 13, 14, to the humble confession of a penitent, 62. Matt. 12. 37, to men's words, Jas. 2. to works proceeding from faith, *ib.* Acts 13. 39, to the other virtues besides faith, *ib.* where expressed by 'forgiveness of sins' attributed to repentance, *ib.* by works, doctrine of, incontrovertible, 124. no denial of it without denial of Scripture, 125. right to the kingdom given in the first, revocable, 131. notion of, from hypocrisy, 139. the two causes of our, stated, 148. meritorious cause of, *ib. causa sine qua non*, of, *ib.* belonged not to law of Moses, 184, 185. presupposes the less and primary sanctification, 202. true and only way of obtaining, declared, 246. acts which precede, 253. no real, before men, 256. formal cause of, 258. condition of, faith and repentance, 260. office of God only, 281. obedience preserves, 307. Roman Catholic doctrine of, 353.
'*Justified to be*' and 'to be made heirs' equivalent, 28.
'*Justify*,' the word used differently under the Gospel, 50.
Justin Martyr, saying of, 162. quoted, 189, 190, 348, 362.

L.

Lambeth, articles of, 230.
Latimer, Bishop, on apostacy, 318. on election, 339, 340.
Law, whole comprised in two things, 96. no perfection by, 187. end of the, 190, 191. corresponds with way of its being given, 193. scrupulosity of, to what end, 197. spoken of in two ways, 197, 198. spiritual, literal, 198.
'*Law the*' used by St. Paul always for the Mosaic, 156.
Law of Christ, not twofold, but one, 89. the moral law, *ib.* Christians to be judged by, 90. "the law of liberty," or "royal law," *ib.* rule of justification, 92. to be obeyed at the hazard of our soul, *ib.* an extension and addition to the Mosaic law, 196.
'*Law of Faith*' requires observance of commandments, 95.
Law of God, approved of by the wicked, 392.
Law of Gospel, not called a law by St. Paul, 156. teaches a perfection of virtue above nature, 161. called by divines 'supernatural,' *ib.*
Law of Moses, perfection of, not denied in Harmony, 154, 155. gave no true remission, 185. not one of absolute perfection, 195. wherein its strictness consisted, 196. weakness of, for producing holiness, 205. tendency of, earthly, 211—214. object of, 348. weakness of, 351.
Law of nature, does not prescribe perfect virtue; heavenly life not due to its observance, 161.
'*Law of perfect obedience*,' what meant by, 158, 159.
Law, ritual, not given till after the pollution of the golden calf, 190. giving of the, how understood by the ancients, 190, 191.
'*Law of works*' the Mosaic law, 93. content with external righteousness, 94. admitted of perfection so of boasting, 95. St. Paul blameless according to it, *ib.* the young man in Matt. 19. 20, had kept the whole, *ib.*
Laws, to fallen man three, 156.
Legislation, Mosaic mode of, described, 191.
Libertines, originated in Lutheranism 68.
Life eternal, in what sense not promised in Old Testament, 205.
Liturgy of Church of England, teaching of, 304.
Lord's Supper, Sacrament of, 179.
Love, form of justifying faith, 16. gives faith its being in God's sight, 19. only to be found in the holy, 20. the form of every virtue, *ib.* chiefly regarded by God, *ib.* fulfilling of the law, 21. determined to be so by Christ Himself, *ib.* first and most excellent of all virtues, 67.
Lucidus, leader of Predestinarian heresy, 327.

Luther and his followers taught that the Gospel consisted of promises only, 68. that Christ gave no law, *ib.*
Lutheranism, tendency of reformed divines to, 68.
Lydda, Synod of, note i, 169, 207.
Lyons, Synod of, 80.
Lyranus, 368.

M.

Macarius, 361.
Maccovius, John, 78.
Maironis Franciscus, 175.
Man, immortality of, first depended on grace and promise of God, 162. gifted not only with natural integrity, but with the Holy Spirit, *ib.* whether before the fall, could have sinned venially, an open question, 175, 176. supported by St. Augustine, 176. fallen, bound to act according to reason, 161.
Marcionites, 97.
Marcus Eremita, 363.
Mayence, Synod of, 328. condemned Gothescalcus, *ib.*
Medæa, example of, 391.
Melancthon, author of Augsburg Confession, 295. on true contrition, 296. on Predestination, 317, 337.
Merit, all notions of, disclaimed, 35. of condignity, 353. supported by Bellarmine, *ib.*
Methodius, 364.
Milevis, canons of Council of, 169.
Μισθὸν λογίζεσθαι, and δικαιοσύνην λογίζεσθαι, not the same, 23.
Montague, his Origines, 233.
Morton, Catholic appeal for Protestants, 306.
Moses, sermon of, in Deuteronomy, 214.
Musculus, 46, 368.

N.

Νεκύια, a proof in belief of the permanency of souls after death, 214.
'*Nostras*,' '*Nostrates*,' use of the words, 69. explained by L. Valla, *ib.*
Novatians, deny repentance after wilful sin, 177. passages adduced by, in support of their opinion, 180.
Novelty, charge of, answered, 3.

O.

Obedience, impossible without grace, 2. all springs from faith in Christ, 96.
Objection, of Censurer's father from the strict meaning of the word 'to justify' answered, 49—53.
Œcumenius, 84.
Opinions, not Socinian, equally pernicious, disclaimed, 241.
Orange, second Council of, 164.
Origen, 8, 266. on possibility of fulfilling all the commandments, 166.
Overall, Bishop, 325. on deadly sin, 309. on satisfaction of Christ, 331.

P.

Pacian, St., 363.
Paræus, 46. arguments of in favour of his interpretation of Rom. 7. 386. *ad fin.*
Pardon, hope of, to greatest sinners, 177.
Parents, our first, unable to attain to virtue fit for heaven without the aid of the Holy Spirit, 163.
Paul, St., not contradicted in the Harmony, 4. argument of, obscure, 6. obscurity of, noted by the Fathers, 8. hardness of, remarked by St. Peter, 9. obscurity of, causes of, 11. means by faith the whole condition of the Gospel, 14, 15. where he teaches that faith without works is sufficient, and why, 14. teaches justification by faith only, no where except in controversy with Jews or enemies of the Gospel, 61. what he calls justification, called by other sacred writers forgiveness, *ib.* had a peculiar reason for calling man's absolution, justification, 62. also for his use of the word 'faith,' *ib.* reasons of, for his mode of argument, 63. specially opposing Jews who clung to the Mosaic law, *ib.* obliged to use the word 'justification,' *ib.* Gal. 2. 16—21, not treating of the moral, but of ritual and Mosaic law, 93, 94. his opponents various, 140. his arguments accordingly different, 141. denies justification to Mosaic law only as it was viewed carnally, *ib.* his argument from natural weakness of man, 142. is treating of the whole economy of human salvation, *ib.* calls the means of procuring that 'faith,' *ib.* when opposing Judaizing Christians uses 'faith' as opposed to Mosaic rites, 143. his meaning of the word 'faith,' 144. his enumeration of mortal sins, 172. in what sense ritual works rejected by, 347. meaning in Rom. 7. from 14, 360, *ad fin.* same person intended throughout, 373. parenthesis in ver. 25, 375. analysis of the chapter, 376. objection from change of tense, 377.

reason of the change, evident, 378. his use of the phrases 'to be carnal,' 'to walk after the flesh,' 379. of the terms, 'carnal,' 'spiritual,' 381. of the figure of change of persons, 387. his meaning of 'without the law,' 388. his use of the phrases 'inner man,' 'the mind,' 'the flesh,' 'outward,' 'old' and 'new man,' 396, 397. of 'delighting in the law,' 395. thanksgiving, ver. 25, 399. parenthesis in ver. 25, explained, 401.

Pelagius, heresy of, 167, 207. his heresy on the subject of promise of eternal life in the covenant of Sinai, 208. why so opposed by the Catholics, 209.

Perseverance, opinion of the Church of England on, 309, 324.

Peter, St., refers to the Valentinians, 10. always considered chief of the Apostles, 32. denial of, considered, 393.

Phineas, zeal of, 27.

Physicians, may be trusted, their remedies refused, 114.

Piscator, 77.

Placæus' notion of justification examined, 133. his sermons on St. James's Epistle, 134. refuted, 135. his notion false in statement, 136. his absurdities exposed, 137. notion false in assumption, 139.

Πολιτεία, meaning of the word, 29.

Popery, charges of, refuted, 235, 236.

Predestinarians, condemned by Council of Arles, 80.

Predestination, speculations on, forbidden by our Church, 342. opinion of Augsburg divines on, *ib.* minute definitions of, made in Pelagian controversy, detrimental to the Church, 343.

Primasius, 367.

Propitiation, of Christ, universal, 78, 79. if denied, an end to preaching the Gospel, 80.

Prosper, opinion of, on love, 20.

Protestants, the older, understood phrase 'by faith only' figuratively, 291.

R.

Rabanus Maurus, 328.

Reconciliation, Scriptural meaning of, 85.

Recovery, after sin, not infallible, 310.

Redemption, offered to all, 83.

Reformation, English, not Calvinistic, 341.

Regenerate, may and do fall away, 310, 311. throughout Holy Scripture, declared to be happy, 400. not called wretched &c. in Holy Scripture, 400.

Remission, implied in justification, 42. not the whole of justification, 43. granted under certain conditions, 44.

Repentance without love, attrition, 22. no sure, without love of God and hatred of sin, *ib.* a condition of justification, 37. precedes it, *ib.* and faith conditions of the same benefit, 40, 41. the free gift of God, 57. works of, twofold, external, internal, 59. for mortal sins must be exact and perfectly worked out, 176. a second plank after shipwreck, 177. the more difficult, the more grievous the sin, 180. time for, no where promised, 181. for mortal sins, what kind it should be, *ib.* danger of deathbed, *ib.* true, contains seeds of all virtues, 254.

Restitution, an external act of repentance, 59.

'*Right* to eternal life,' explained, 358.

'*Righteousness*,' 'forgiveness of sins,' 'justification,' equivalent terms, 46. none without repentance, 60. distinction of, imputed and inherent treated of at length, 72—88. imputed, the phrase no where occurs in Holy Scripture, 72. omitted in foreign Confessions, *ib.* of Christ, not imputed, but that for which our faith is imputed, *ib.* Catholic doctrine of, 73. doctrine of the English Church and of Gallican Confession on, *ib.* Censurer supposes Christ's really to become ours, 74.

——— *imputed*, Censurer's view of, overturns whole of gospel economy, 74. cannot stand with forgiveness of sins on God's part, 75. incompatible with repentance on our part, *ib.* takes away necessity of faith, 76, 77. overturns Catholic doctrine of universal propitiation, 78. defenders of, deny universal satisfaction, *ib.* texts adduced by Censurer and others for their view of, answered, 80—87.

——— *inherent*, denied by Censurer, 87. a condition of justification, 88. our, subordinate to Christ's, dependent on it, *ib.*

Righteous men, liable to certain sins, compatible with a state of grace, 172.

Riveta, opponent of Grotius, 325.

S.

Salvation, order of, described, 1 Pet. 1. 2, 36. eternal, promised only by the Gospel, 142, 143.

Sanctification, owing to the blood of Christ, 36. especially attributed to the Spirit, *ib.* not to be separated from justification, 202.
Saravia, defence against Beza, 232.
Satisfaction, object of, to make room for forgiveness, 56. of Christ delivers no one *ipso facto*, 57. but under the condition of repentance, *ib.*
Saul, case of, 296. once a righteous man, 315.
Saxon Confession, written to be proposed at Council of Trent, 321.
Schoolmen, distinctions of, on mortal and venial sins, 175.
Scotus, 175.
Scripture, obscurer passages of, to be explained by the clearer, 6.
Sedulius, 362, 367.
Simon Magus, heresies of, 9, 98.
Sin, mortal, of, 173. hatred of, found in the wicked, 391.
Sins, distinction of, to be maintained, 321, 322.
Smoutius, his "Pater Noster," 78.
Socinianism, teaching of Censurer closely allied to, 56. disclaimed, 148. charge of, 237.
Socinian interpretation of Rom. 3. 25, 151.
Socinus, divinity of Christ denied by, 238. also His satisfaction, 239, 240.
'*Sold unto sin*,' argument from the phrase, 382. how used by Hebrews, 383.
Solifidians, 98.
Spalato, Archbishop of, 170.
Strasburg, Confession of, history of drawing up of, 299.
Suarez, 359.
Σύμφημι, 395.
Συνήδεσθαι τῷ νόμῳ, 395.
Συνήδομαι, 395.
Supererogation, works of, no room for, in the law of Christ, 171.
Symmachians, 94.
Synod, held in London, 1571, 329.
'*Syzygy*' of Valentinians, 326.

T.

Taylor, Bishop, 368.
Tertullian, 5, 190, 197, 271. rule of, examined, 13.
Text of Rom. 3. 25. considered, 149.
Theodoret, 8, 361.
Theophylact, 84, 87, 361.
Thief, penitent, case of, does not favour the Censurer's views, 114. eminent for good works, 114, 115.
Thyatira, Church of, 178.
Tilenus, 121.
Time-serving, charge of, answered, 346.
Toledo, Cardinal, 368.
Trent, Council of, 236. Catechism of, 368, 369.
Truman, Mr., his book against the author, 162, 163. defends heresy of Pelagius, note p. 209, 349.
Trust, absolute and conditional, 106. Censurer rejects both, 106, 107. conditional, useless without performance of the condition, 107. of a Christian, no other than conditional, 108. Christian, sometimes means assent to the Gospel with desire of its promises, 121. used so by divines, *ib.* each act of, in its wider sense, compatible with the case of one not in a state of salvation, 122. unavailing without earnest desire, 123. such the same as faith perfected by love, *ib.*
Tully, Dr., his imperfect examination of the Harmony, 225. unfairness of, in quotations, 226. his book a mere declamation, *ib.* attacks the heads of our Church, through the Harmonist, 227, 228. invidiousness of the title of his book, 228. preface of his book, 243. decries as Gallios, those who abstain from the controversy, *ib.* his theology, subtile and fine-drawn, *ib.* sobriety of, in conducting the controversy, 248, 249. view of state of the question, 250. explanation of the point at issue, 257. sophistry of, refuted, 262. unfair in quoting Articles and Homilies, 275, 276. his Enchiridion, 308. teaches indefectibility of faith, *ib.* considers all works opposed to grace, 344. dishonesty of, in his quotations exposed, 356, 357. his three assertions against the author on Rom. 7. 361. object of his book, 369. specimen of his philosophy, 389.

V.

Valence, Synod of, 328.
Valentinians, derided the Catholics for their view of faith and works, 10. originated dogma of indefectibility, 326. their 'syzygy,' 326.
Valentinus, on justification, 10. gave a new dress to heresy of Simon, *ib.*
Vasquez, 360.
Vatablus, 213.
Virtues, Christian, habits, 252. partly infused, partly acquired, *ib.* 253.
Vossius, G., 127, 207. gives opinion of the Fathers on perseverance, 324, 368.

W.

White, Francis, 306.
'*Willing*' and 'performing,' difference between, 390.
Wittemberg, Synod of, 321.
Works, what kind excluded by St. Paul, 146, 147. what and in what sense excluded from justifying, 200, 201.
'*Worthiness*' explained, 345.
Wurtemberg, Confession of, 297, 298.

Z.

Zegerus, 144, 368.
Zitinius, Nicolas, case of, 400.
Zuinglius, teaches faith in its complex sense, 152—154.

INDEX OF TEXTS

CITED AND EXPLAINED IN THIS VOLUME.

GENESIS.

3. 15. 333.
5. 24. 214.
15. 4, 5. 333.
17. 1. 333.
— 10—12. 34.
25. 23. 334.
44. 16. 49.
45. 26. 119.

EXODUS.

14. 31. 119.
19. 9. 119.
24. 3. 191.
33. 19. 338.
34. 7. 202.

LEVITICUS.

16. 2. 151.

NUMBERS.

7. 8, 9. 151.
25. 12. 27.

DEUTERONOMY.

6. 5. 303.
9. 23. 119.
10. 12—16. 214.
25. 1. 49, 51, 52.
30. 6. 214.

I. SAMUEL.

15. 22. 214.

II. SAMUEL.

19. 23. 51.

I. KINGS.

1. 21. 81.
2. 8, 9. 51.
20. 11. 357.
21. 20. 380.

II. CHRONICLES.

13. 18. 101.

JOB.

13. 15. 100.
27. 5. 49.

PSALMS.

1. 1. 318.
2. 12. 101.
5. 4. 336, 338.
— 6. 173.
15. 311.
19. 4. 340.
— 7, 8. 211, 212.
22. 4. 101.
32. 10. 101.
37. 3, 5. 101, 117.
— 40. 101.
50. 7—17. 214.
51. 181.
— 4. 49.
— 16, 17. 214.
52. 7. 101.
62. 10. 101.
— 12. 130.
78. 38. 37, 38, 51.
82. 3. 52.
106. 31. 27.
118. 8, 9. 101.
146. 5. 101.

PROVERBS.

1. 23. 254.
3. 5. 101.
11. 25. Sept. 365.
24. 16. 319.
26. 11. 315.
28. 13. 181.

ISAIAH.

1. 10—21. 214.
— 16—18. 260.
5. 5, 6. 312.
26. 4. 101.
29. 13. 302.
47. 10. 101.
57. 15. 254.
66. 1, 2. 254.

JEREMIAH.

3. — 177.
7. 21—23. 214.
17. 5, 7. 101.
31. 13. 164.

EZEKIEL.

18. 20. 173.
— 21, 23. 261.
— 30, 31. 261.
33. 18. 322.

DANIEL.

7. 18. 208.

HOSEA.

6. 6. 214.
13. 9. 336, 338.

JOEL.

2. 12. 269.

JONAH.

1. 334.
3. 5. 119.

MICAH.

3. 4. 323.
6. 6—8. 214.

MALACHI.

1. 2, 3. 334.

I. MACCABEES.

1. 15. 383.

ST. MATTHEW.

3. 8. 254.
5. 11, 12. 242.
— 16. 71.
— 19, 20, 30. 96, 114.
6. 33. 122.
7. 21, 24, 27. 96.
11. 19. 49.
12. 37. 61, 62, 97.
15. 8, 9. 302.
16. 27. 130.
— 37, 38. 123.
19. 20. 63.
— 23—26. 180.
— 26. 95.
22. 31, 32. 205.
— 35—40. 21.
26. 27, 28. 179.
— 41. 247.
— 75. 181.
27. 43. 101.

ST. MARK.

1. 4. 261.
— 15. 37.

ST. LUKE.

2. 9, 13. 254.
— 26. 322.
3. 3. 62.
7. 38. 181.
13. 3—5. 60.
— 24. 122.
14. 25—33. 123.
15. 7. 42.
18. 13, 14. 47.
21. 36. 247.
24. 27. 48.
— 46, 47. 62, 261.

ST. JOHN.

1. 12. 130.
2. 23, 24. 114, 119.
3. 3, 6. 164, 397.
6. 5, 6. 164.
— 29. 63.
— 44. 254, 338.
8. 24. 152.
9. 35. 116.
12. 42. 114, 119.
14. 16. 151.
14. 17—23. 254.
20. 31. 116.

ACTS.

2. 3. 33.
— 38. 37, 254, 261.
3. 19. 37, 130, 261.
5. 31. 48, 62.
— 32. 254.
7. 38. 192.
8. 37. 63, 116.
— 22. 261.
10. 2. 33.
— 4. 34.
— 22. 33.
— 34, 35. 32.
— 43. 33.
13. 38, 39. 14,15,44,45,61,185.
15. 178.
— 10, 14. 193, 195.
16. 14. 254.
26. 17, 18. 47, 130.
26. 20. 254.

ROMANS.

1. 18. 173.
2. 6. 130.
— 12. 156, 387.
3. 5, 6, 7. 401.
— 7. 5, 386.
— 20. 132.
— 23, 24. 47.
— 24. 53, 57, 148.
— 25. 145, 149.
— 27, 28. 70, 89, 93, 136.
4. 4—6. 23.
— 5. 153.

4. 6, 7. 29.
— 6—8. 46, 54.
— 13, 14, 16. 28, 188.
— 24. 63.
— 20, 21, 24. 152.
— 3, 8, 9, 22, 23, 24, 72.
5. 6, 10. 142.
— 9, 10. 48, 53, 85.
— 15. 333.
— 17, 18. 28, 333.
— 19. 54, 81.
6. 23. 164, 173.
7. 14—25. 360, ad fin.
— 12, 14. 197.
— 18, 22, 23. 397.
— 25. 308—401.
8. 1. 379.
— 2—4. 166.
— 7. 381.
— 15. 212.
— 17. 130.
— 23. 87.
— 24. 153.
9. 15. 338.
10. 5. 28.
— 11. 101.
— 18. 340.
11. 28, 29. 348.
13. 10. 21.
14. 9. 81.
— 28. 89.
16. 21. 96.

I. CORINTHIANS.

1. 30. 86, 124.
4. 3—5. 257.
— 4. 49.
6. 311.
— 9, 10. 172.
7. 19. 95, 103, 347.
9. 20, 21. 387.
11. 21. 380.
13. 2, 3. 18, 20, 67, 114, 256.
— 13. 127.

II. CORINTHIANS.

1. 6. 17.
4. 12. 17.
— 16. 398.
— 17. 127.
5. 19, 21. 54, 74, 81, 83, 85.
7. 11. 181.
12. 20, 21. 179, 380.

GALATIANS.

12. 16, 21. 98.
3. 8, 9, 11, 18, 21. 28.
— 8, 16, 17. 165.
— 10. 154, 155.
— 13. 84.
— 14. 254.
— 19. 94.
3. 26. 130.
— 28. 333.
4. 3. 190.
— 6. 253.
— 15. 180.
— 24. 212.
5. 6. 17, 95, 103, 123, 142, 347.
— 14. 21.
— 19—21. 172, 182.
— 20. 380.
6. 1. 179.
— 8. 127.
— 15. 103, 142, 347.

EPHESIANS.

1. 7. 47, 53, 150.
— 13. 254.
2. 8. 254.
— 12. 141, 160.
3. 20. 18.
4. 30. 87.
5. 2. 241.

PHILIPPIANS.

1. 11. 130.
2. 12. 127, 247.
3. 4—6. 63.
— 8, 9, 10. 87.
— 23. 348.

COLOSSIANS.

1. 14. 47, 53, 150.
— 29. 18.
2. 8, 20. 190.
— 11—13. 348.
3. 11. 333.
— 13. 51.
— 14. 20.

II. THESSALONIANS.

1. 7. 357.
— 8. 127.
2. 7. 18.

I. TIMOTHY.

1. 5. 92.
3. 16. 49.
6. 17. 101.

II. TIMOTHY.

2. 25. 254.
4. 8. 357.

TITUS.

1. 1, 2. 165.
2. 14. 36.
3. 7. 53.

HEBREWS.

2. 2. 192.
— 10. 137.

3. 311.
5. 8, 9. 137, 141.
6. 3. 324.
— 4—6. 180, 327.
— 10. 357.
8. 10. 166.
— 12. 48.
9. 9. 187.
— 12. 141.
— 13. 199.
— 12—14. 36, 150.
— 18—22. 150.
10. 26, 27. 180.
11. 1. 152.
— 16. 205.

ST. JAMES.

2. 61.
2. 21—23. 7.
— 24. 139.
3. 2. 172.

I. PETER.

1. 2. 35.
— 4. 130.
— 21. 98.
2. 333.
3. 4. 66.
4. 19. 117.
5. 5. 254.

II. PETER.

1. 4. 39.
1. 8, 11, note. 131.
2. 20—22. 315.
3. 8. 171.

I. JOHN.

1. 9. 53, 261.
2. 1, 2. 177.
3. 8. 173.
4. 15, 16. 116, 153.
5. 5. 116.
— 4, 5. 116, 152.

ST. JUDE.

Ver. 14. 214.

REVELATIONS.

1. 5. 36.
2. 5. 178, 247.
3. 20. 253, 254.
7. 14, 15. 127.
9. 2. 8.
22. 12. 130.
— 14. 357.

3 b 7 / TM

OXFORD:
PRINTED BY I. SHRIMPTON.

12346 234.7E B872eE
Bull George
Examen Censura:

12346 234.7E B872eE